



Nationalism in conflict in  
India

By  
M. R. T.



# FOREWORD

by

Qaid-i-Azam Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah

---

India of modern conception with its so-called present geographical unity is entirely the creation of the British who hold it as one administrative unit by a system of bureaucratic government whose ultimate sanction is the sword and not the will or the sanction of the people behind the government so established. This position is very much exploited by the Hindu Congress and another Hindu organisation, the Hindu Mahasabha. India is a vast sub-continent. It is neither a country nor a nation. It is composed of nationalities and races, but the two major nations are the Muslims and the Hindus. Talk of Indian unity as one central constitutional government of this vast sub-continent is simply a myth.

The differences in India between the two major nations, the Hindus and the Muslims, are a thousand times greater when compared with the continent of Europe. In fact the diversity of its races, religions, cultures and languages has no parallel in any other part of the world, but fortunately the Muslim homelands are in the North Western and Eastern zones of the sub-continent where they are in a solid

## Foreword

majority with a population of nearly 70 millions and they desire that these parts should be separated from the rest of India and constituted into independent sovereign states. The Muslims stand unequivocally for their own freedom and independence and also that of Hindus and the Hindu India in the sub-continent of India, whereas the Hindu machinations and all proposals and schemes suggested by them are intended and calculated to bring a hundred million Muslims under the subjugation and hegemony of the Hindu Raj over the entire sub continent of India which means that Muslims shall be merely transferring their bondage of slavery from the British Raj to the Hindu Raj. In sheer ignorance or with a view to misguide the foreign opinion deliberately in their own favour it is urged in these days that India's case has a parallel in China Soviet Russia or even in the United States of America and that its problems can be successfully tackled in the light of experience gained by the peoples of these countries. A cursory examination of such a plea by any intelligent man will convince him that it is completely misleading to compare India's problems with these countries.

The present books are a collection of articles which had appeared in different newspapers and had thrown a great deal of light on the

Pakistan demand of Muslim India, and hence I agreed to their being collected and published in the form of two books as they explain the Muslim position regarding many of the current political issues which have been agitating the Muslim mind. The author Mr M R T has given his consent that these books should be issued on behalf of the Home Study Circle. He has marshalled facts and figures which are very valuable and he has done a great service already by periodically publishing them in various newspapers. In the first book, entitled 'Pakistan and Muslim India', he has placed in a very impartial way the exposition of many factors which clearly demonstrate that the only solution of India's constitutional problem is by means of partition of India and by accepting the fundamental principles of Pakistan scheme, laid down in the Lahore resolution of the All India Muslim League, passed in March, 1940.

The second book entitled 'Nationalism In Conflict In India', contains the collection of writings of the same author. This will show that India is not a national State, that India is not a country but a sub-continent composed of nationalities, the two major nations being the Hindus and the Muslims whose culture and civilisation, language and literature, art and architecture, name and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, laws and jurisprudence, social and moral codes,

## ' Foreword

customs and calendar history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions outlook on life and of life are fundamentally different, nay in many respects antagonistic

Of course the views expressed in these books are of the author and not the official views of the Muslim League or myself I have undertaken to write this foreward in order to commend these two books to all readers who want to understand the problem of India's future constitution and its solution and I feel confident that anyone who reads them dispassionately and with an open mind will find by the sheer facts and figures and historical and political arguments advanced that partition of India is in the interest of both the major nations Hindus and Muslims

M A. Jinnah

24th December 1942  
10 Aurangzeb Road  
New Delhi

## P R E F A C E

This book like the first one entitled 'Pakistan and Muslim India' is also a collection of articles written for the press during the period 1939 to 1942. It is divided for the sake of convenience into 4 parts. Articles dealing with topics of an allied nature are grouped together to form one part.

In the first part under 'Nationalism' it is proved from the professions of Hindu leaders that Hindus are a separate nation from Muslims, that with Hindus nationalism is another name for pan-Hinduism, and that the real basis of their nationalism is Hindu religion. Further it is amplified what the motives behind Congress Nationalism are, that Nationalism of Congress conception is no solution of Hindu-Muslim problem, that the one nation theory of Mr. Gandhi is a myth and that nationalism ultimately leads to aggression. All these points are dealt with in one or other of the six articles that form this part.

The second part under 'Lessons From Abroad' illustrates from the political experience in the working of parliamentary institutions in other countries that democracy can only function successfully in a truly homo-



## Preface

geneous society closely bound by similar traditions and that partition is the only solution where irreconcilable differences divide one group of people forming majority in a compact part of a loosely united country from another group forming a majority in the remaining part. Those who draw the conclusion from the example of the British dominions of Canada, South Africa and Australia that the solution of India's constitutional problem lies in the adoption of a federal constitution will read in the article under *Lessons From British Dominions* that federation is only possible where there is a real desire for union on the part of federating units and that this desire for union has been the result of special circumstances in case of each British Dominion. The Congress Leftists who often advocate the future government of India on soviet lines will learn from the article on *Soviet Russia* that India's case stands on a different footing from that of Soviet Russia and that they can best follow the example of Ireland as shown in *Vivisection of the British Isles*. The last article in this part on *Democracy and India* answers the critics who raised a storm of opposition when Mr Jinnah said in course of a speech that Western democracy is not suited to the Indian genius.

The third part under *Communalism* discusses the causes of Hindu Muslim differences as well as the Indian political deadlock. It explains in the first article that apart from

religion, political and economic causes are also responsible for communal differences, and in the second article that the British rule did not create communalism as its roots lie deep in the caste-system and Hindu exclusiveness in the social, economic and political field. It is pointed out in the 'third article on Mr Amery's speech on India First that the present political deadlock can neither be resolved by 'Mr Amery's insisting on 'India First' nor by the Viceroy's repudiating of August Declaration of 1940 and emphasising India's so-called geographical unity. The fourth article on Political Deadlock in India is in Mr Jinnahs' own words, a fair summary of the recent events' while that on 'Viceroy's August Declaration' will clearly, indicate that Hindus oppose what Muslims support in the political field. In the concluding article of this part, under 'Choice Before Britain', the British Government is reminded that a policy of Congress appeasement at the expense of Muslim League will neither assist substantially in the war effort nor furnish a permanent basis for the settlement of the political deadlock.

Part IV, under 'Readings From Congress Mind', describes the latest trend in Congress policy in the following directions—

- (1) Hindu-Muslim unity is not necessary for the attainment of independence,
- (2) The present war has given the Cong-

ress an opportunity to coerce the British Government to accept Congress demand for complete independence and to repudiate League scheme of Pakistan

(3) Hindu Muslim problem is a domestic one and will be settled in peace or by war at the attainment of independence.

The articles in this part will show that the Congress denies to Muslim what it claims for Hindus on the principle of self determination that it will rather see India fall into Japanese hands than agree to recognise the justice of Muslim case and form a united front as urged by Mr Rajgopalachari against the common danger that the Congress leaders are never sincere in their attitude towards the Muslim League and will spare no efforts to misrepresent it as the articles on Gandhis Professions and Performance and Pt Nehrus Propaganda in America will indicate and that the Congress wants a Gandhian Dictatorship to ride rough shod over the interests of Muslims and other minorities. Copious quotations are given from Mr Gandhis writings in the Harijan to prove his double dealings and inconsistency in attitude. These articles were written in August 1942 just on the eve of the Congress threat for mass Civil Disobedience and so should be read with special reference to the conditions that existed then. The last article refers to the year 1939 when the Muslim League had not yet

## Preface

officially adopted Pakistan as its political goal. It traces the gradual development of circumstances which caused a final split in the political ambitions of the two major political parties. The League in 1939 demanded merely strong and effective representation at the Centre, and full provincial autonomy for Provinces with residuary powers vested in them but the failure of the Congress to satisfy Muslim demands and the anti-Muslim policy of the Congress Ministries in Hindu Majority Provinces forced the Muslims to declare in 1940 that Pakistan was the only solution for the final and lasting settlement of the communal problem in India.

Four articles out of the whole lot in this book may be selected for particular reading as they furnish definite ideas as to the practicability of one nation or two nation theory, federation or partition. These are 'Nationalism is no solution of Hindu-Muslim Problem' and 'One Nation Myth Exposed' in Part I and 'Vivisection of the British Isles' and 'Lessons From British Dominions' in Part II.

Each article is self-sufficient and deals with the main idea as expressed by its very name. The central idea of a group of 5 or 6 articles is indicated by the heading of the Part under which they are included. The four parts are (1) Nationalism (2) Lessons From Abroad

(3) Communalism (4) Readings From Congress Mind.

The name as well as the general plan in the arrangement of articles in this book as in the case of Pakistan and Muslim India were approved by the Qaid-i Azam who was also kind enough to write a common foreword for both the books. But for his consent the books would have never been published.

This however does not mean that the views expressed by me in these books are also officially approved by the All India Muslim League or the Qaid-i Azam. There is no doubt that I have been guided by the policy of the Muslim League throughout my writings but I do not claim infallibility for my views on that account. At the most I can safely say that I have tried to interpret the League view point to the best of my intentions and have only differed from it where it was possible to entertain more than one opinion. We are all agreed on the broad principles (1) that Muslim League represents Muslim India (2) that Pakistan is the final goal of Muslim India. There may be difference of opinion as to whether Pakistan should be achieved by stages or in one instalment whether our methods should be constitutional or revolutionary whether the territorial limits of Pakistan should be determined by the proportion of our population in Muslim zones

## Preface

or in India as a whole. A Muslim who keeps in mind the two broad principles outlined above will never stray from the right path which the League has chosen and the Qaid-i-Azam has blessed for him. The Lahore Resolution of 1940 popularly known as the Pakistan Scheme has become the Magna Carta of Muslim India which now has one flag, one platform and one goal. The Muslims stand solidly behind the League and as the Qaid-i-Azam has desired, their watchword now is faith, unity and discipline.

I shall be failing in my duty if I do not acknowledge help from friends in the work entrusted to me by the Qaid-i-Azam. S Shamsul Hasan was mainly responsible for supervising the printing, while S. Budrul Hasan, Mr S M Khalid and S. Ziaul Hasan assisted me in proof reading. I express my sincere thanks to all of them.

31-12-42

M R T.



# CONTENTS

## Part I Nationalism.

	Page
1 Two Nations in India.	1
2 Real Basis of Nationalism in India. ...	12
3 Motives behind Congress Nationalism. ...	19
4. Nationalism is no Solution of Hindu-Muslim Problem ...	28
5 Mr. Gandhi's One Nation Myth Exposed. ...	42
6 Dangers of Aggressive Nationalism. ...	57

## Part II Lessons from Abroad

1. Political Experience of other Countries. ...	80
2 Vivisection of the British Isles. ...	95
3. Soviet Russia and its Minorities. ...	101
4 Lessons From British Dominion.	
1. Canada. ...	120
2. South Africa. ...	132
3. Australia. ...	140
4. Ireland. ...	150
5. Democracy and India. ....	158



# CONTENTS

## Part III Communalism

	Page
1 Political and Economic Causes of Hindu Muslim differences	169
2 Origin of Communalism	192
3 Mr Amery's Speech on India First"	209
4 Political Deadlock in India.	228
5 Viceroy's August Declaration	236
6 Choice Before Britain	245

## Part IV Readings From Congress Mind

1 Congress Speaks With Two Voices	254
2 Congress Wants Swaraj under Japanese Protection	261
3 Gandhian Dictatorship	271
4 Gandhi's Professions and Performance.	280
5 Pt. Nehru's Propaganda in America	291
6 Congress and Muslim League Differences	297

# PART I

## NATIONALISM

### 1 TWO NATIONS IN INDIA

The Congress-League problem admits of a very easy solution once it is conceded that Hindus and Muslims are two separate nations. The Congress, however, claims that it alone has the right to speak on behalf of all classes and communities of this vast sub-continent as it represents the Indian nation. This position of the Congress is challenged by the Muslim League which is the only authoritative and representative organisation of 90 millions of Muslims.

Of late prominent Hindu leaders have been carrying on whirlwind propaganda to prove that Muslims are an integral part of the Indian nation and are identical with the Hindus racially, culturally and economically. The Muslim demand for Pakistan is considered as a negation of nationalism and their right to apply the principle of self-determination to predominantly Muslim areas is condemned in the strongest terms.

Mr. Munshi says that the Pakistan movement is intended to destroy the Indian nation.

Mr Satyamurti denies that Hindus and Muslims have any racial or cultural differences. They might, he says worship different gods but their outlook and culture are the same fundamentally. Even a staunch Hindu like Sir S Radhakrishnan who asserts in his essay on the spirit of Hinduism that Hinduism is not an idea but power that Hindu culture has maintained its tradition unbroken to the present day reminds the Muslims that India has been a nation from early times. To repeat his actual words "If a nation is a body of men and women with their roots in the past and shaped by long historic processes India is a nation from early times."

I will prove herewith that these views of Hindu leaders are absolutely wrong and are effectively contradicted by other prominent Hindu leaders who recognise that Hindus and Muslims are separate nations.

L Hardyal wrote as early as 1925 in the "Pratap" of Lahore that if the British left India the Hindu nation would be threatened by Afghanistan and that if the Hindu wanted to protect themselves they must conquer Afghanistan and the frontiers."

I reproduce his actual statement—"I declare that the future of the Hindu race of Hindustan and of the Punjab rests on these four pillars (1) Hindu Sangathan (2) Hindu

Raj, (3) Shudhī of Muslims, (4) and conquest and Shudhī of Afghanistan and the frontiers. So long as the Hindu nation does not accomplish these four things, the safety of our children and great-grand children will be ever in danger, and the safety of the Hindu race will be impossible. The Hindu race has but one history, and its institutions are homogeneous. But the Mussalmans and Christians are far removed from the confines of Hinduism, for their religions are alien and they love Persian, Arabic and European institutions."

"Thus, just as one removes foreign matter from the eye, Shuddhī must be made of these two religions. Afghanistan and the hilly regions of the frontier were formerly part of India but are at present under the domination of Islam. Just as there is Hindu religion in Nepal, so there must be Hindu institutions in Afghanistan and the frontier territory, otherwise it is useless to win Swaraj. For mountain tribes are always warlike and hungry. If they become our enemies, the age of Nadirshah and Zamanshah will begin anew. At present English officers are protecting the frontiers, but it cannot always be. If Hindūs want to protect themselves, they must conquer Afghanistan and the frontiers and convert all the mountain tribes."

This statement clearly proves that a community which entertains such feelings of hatred

and revenge against a neighbouring Muslim State and relies on violence for the establishment of Hindu Raj and the conversion of Muslims cannot live on terms of amity with the latter. Such exclusive sentiments can only be nurtured by a nation bent on aggression against another. If the Hindu race has one history and homogeneous institutions and Muslims have an alien religion and alien institutions then evidently both represent separate nations.

Conclusive evidence on this point is further furnished by the writings of Mr Savarkar President, All-India Hindu Maha Sabha, who at present commands equally with the greatest Congress leaders, immense influence among the Hindus. In a speech at the Hindu Maha Sabha session held at Ahmadabad in 1937 he said "Several infantile politicians commit the serious mistake that India is already welded into a harmonious nation of that it could be welded thus far for the mere wish to do so. These our well meaning but unthinking friends take their dreams for realities. That is why they are impatient of communal tangles and attribute them to communal organisations."

"But the solid fact is that the so-called communal questions are but a legacy handed down to us by centuries of a cultural religious and national antagonism between the Hindus and the Muslims. When time is ripe you can solve them but you cannot suppress them by

merely refusing recognition of them. It is safer to diagnose and treat deepseated disease than to ignore it. Let us bravely face unpleasant facts as they are. India cannot be assumed to-day to be a unitarian and homogeneous nation but on the contrary there are two nations in the main the Hindus and Muslims in India."

Defining the aims of the Hindu Mahasabha as representative of the Hindu nation, Mr Savarkar says. "It has come to my notice that a very large section of English-educated Hindus holds back from joining the Hindu Mahasabha under the erroneous idea that it is an exclusively religious organisation, something like a Christian Mission . . . . It is not a Hindu Dharma Mahasabha, but a Hindu national Mahasabha. As a national body, it will of course propagate and defend the National Hindu Church comprising each and all religions of Hindustani origin against any non-Hindu attack or encroachment. But the sphere of its activity is far more comprehensive than that of an exclusively religious body. The Hindu Mahasabha identifies itself with the National life of Hindustan in all its entirety, in all its social, economical, cultural and above all political aspects and is pledged to protect and promote all that contributes to the freedom and glory of the Hindu nation."

Mr Savarkar places the foundation of the

Hindu nation on two conditions firstly the retention of the name Hindustan as the proper name for India This name is preferred by him as it signifies the land of the Hindu His second condition is that Sanskrit should be retained as a sacred language, Hindi as a national language and Nagri as the script of Hindudom

Clarifying the Hindu position further on the question of Hindi or Hindustani he writes -

This Sanskrit Nista Hindi has nothing to do with that hybrid the so-called Hindustani which is being batched up by the Wardha Scheme It is nothing short of a linguistic monstrosity and must be ruthlessly suppressed Not only that but it is our bounden duty to oust out as ruthlessly all unnecessary alien words whether Arabic or English from every Hindu tongue whether provincial or dialectical." Mr Savarkar insists on these two conditions as he thinks that Hindus are a nation by themselves

In support of his theory of a separate Hindu nation he argues in the following words — Only those nations have persisted to maintaining their National unity and identity during the last three or four centuries in Europe which had developed racial linguistic, culture and such other organic affinities in addition to their territorial unity or even at times inspite of it and consequently willed to be homogeneous national units—such as England France Germany Italy Portugal etc "

“Judged by any and all of these tests which go severally and collectively to form such a homogeneous and organic nation, in India we Hindus are marked out as an abiding Nation by ourselves. Not only we own a common Fatherland, a Territorial unity, but what is scarcely found anywhere else in the world, we have a common Holy Land which is identified with one common Fatherland. This Bharat Bhumi, this Hindustan, India, is both our Fatherland and Holy Land. Our patriotism is therefore doubly sure.

“Then we have common affinities, Cultural, Religious, Historical, Linguistic and Racial, which through the process of centuries centuries of association and assimilation moulded us into a homogeneous and organic Nation and above all infused a will to lead a corporate and common National Life.”

Mr Savarkar concludes his statement with clear words which admit of no ambiguity in meaning. He says, “We Hindus, inspite of a thousand and one differences within our fold, are bound by such religious, cultural, historical, racial, linguistic and other affinities in common as to stand out as a definitely homogeneous people as soon as we are placed in contrast with any other non-Hindu people—say the English or Japanese or even the Indian Muslims. That is the reason why to-day we Hindus from



Kashmere to Madras and Sindh to Assam will be a nation by ourselves.

In face of the above lucid and frank exposition of the Hindu case as a separate nation there is not the least doubt to think that Muslims form a separate nation by themselves. Indeed in this respect both Mr Jinnah and Mr Savarkar are in full agreement. Both insist that there are two nations in India but they differ in regard to the conditions on which the two nations should live

Dr Ambedkar thus criticises the attitude of Mr Savarkar in regard to Muslim demand for Pakistan "Mr Savarkar admits that Muslims are a separate nation. He concedes that they have a right to cultural autonomy. He allows them to have a national flag. Yet he opposes the demand of the Muslim nation for a separate national home. If he claims a national home for the Hindu nation how can he refuse the claim of the Muslim nation for a national home?"

Continuing his argument, Dr Ambedkar says "History records two ways as being open to a major nation to deal with minor nation when they are citizens of the same country and are subject to the same constitution. One way is to destroy the nationality of the minor nation and to assimilate it and absorb it into the major nation so as to make one nation out of the two

## TWO NATIONS IN INDIA

This is done by denying to the minor nation any right to language, religion and culture and by seeking to enforce upon it the language, religion and culture of the major nation. The other way is to divide the country and to allow the minor nation a separate, autonomous and sovereign existence, independent of the major nation. Both these ways were tried in Austria and Turkey, the second after the failure of the first.

Dr Ambedkar advises the second course and warns against the dangers resulting from the scheme of the Hindu Maha Sabha, as this will establish a swaraj in which there will be two nations under the mantle of one single constitution in which the major nation will be allowed to hold the minor nation in subordination to itself. He cites the instances of Austria, Czecho-Slovakia and Turkey which denied the right of selfdetermination to important nationalities within their state limits and hence fell an easy prey to foreign intrigues and internal desintegration.

Congress leaders, in their desire to preserve what they call India's integrity, unity and indivisibility, emphasise the necessity of Hindu-Muslim unity, but they forget that "political unity is worthnothing if it is not the expression of real union." Muslims have no desire to give up their individuality and merge into a common Indian nation. Similarly

the Hindus have no real desire for unity or fusion as they are not prepared to lose contact with their past traditions and customs and to tolerate what they call alien institutions. Where the will to unite is lacking political union under a single government cannot create it. As Dr Ambedkar says "I do not think that a permanent union can be made to depend upon the satisfaction of mere material interests." According to him, pacts may produce unity. But that unity can never ripen into union."

M Renan the famous French writer supports the same idea when he says "Community of interests is assuredly a powerful bond between men. But nevertheless can interests suffice to make a nation? I do not believe it. Community of interests make commercial treaties. There is a sentimental side to nationality it is at once body and soul. Zollverein is not a fatherland."

James Bryce expresses his views in these words. "The permanence of an institution depends not merely on the material interests that support it but on its conformity to the deep rooted sentiment of the men for whom it is made." The strongest bond that alone can furnish a permanent guarantee for the union of two peoples is Religion and this bond is lacking in India. Professor Marvin emphasising the part that Religion has played in

preserving the unity of the Roman Empire, thus records his impressions, "The unity of the Roman Empire was mainly political and military. It lasted for between four and five hundred years. The unity which supervened in the Catholic Church was religious and moral and endured for a thousand years"

Bryce describes the unifying effect of Christianity as common religion in these words, "It is on religion that the inmost and deepest life of a nation rests... The first lesson of Christianity was love, a love that was to join in one body those whom suspicion and prejudice and pride of race had hitherto kept apart. There was thus formed by the new religion a community of the faithful, a Holy Empire, designed to get all men into its bosom."

## 2 REAL BASIS OF NATIONALISM IN INDIA

With Hindus pan Hinduism is a virtue and pan Islamism a vice. No better proof can be given of their inconsistency in argument than the presidential address of Mr Savarkar which was to have been delivered at the banned session of the Hindu Mahasabha at Bhagalpur. Mr Savarkar calls upon all Hindus to realise the significance of the pan Hindu aspect in all future electoral campaigns and advises them to return only Hindu Mahasabha representatives to the Legislatures so as to form in almost all provinces Hindu Sangathanist Ministries "pledged to safeguard Hindu interests openly and uncompromisingly. He suggests even in the Hindu minority provinces powerful Hindu Sangathanist opposition parties to exercise "an effective check on the Muslim Ministries to defeat their anti-Hindu aggressions. Mr Savarkar takes pride in the fact that it has been an outstanding achievement of the Hindu Mahasabha that it has already proved to be a formidable opponent to the inordinate ambitions of the Muslims in general and the Muslim League in particular.

The absurdity of Mr Savarkar's position becomes quite clear when he condemns in the

same address what he calls pan-Islamic ideals of the Muslim League and warns the Muslims that the time has come when "they should realise in their own interests that they should accept the inevitable and should cease amusing themselves with airy nothings" as "they are in a minority and there is not the slightest chance now to reduce the present majority of the Hindus in any appreciable measure."

The provocative language of Mr. Savarkar, instead of carrying conviction to Muslims and inspiring their confidence, exasperates them all the more and hardens their determination to seek liberation from the domination of a community which will be permanently hostile in its attitude and intentions to Muslim interests if it happens to win Purna Swaraj. If it is a virtue to rally Hindus all over India and even in those parts of Africa and Asia where they have settled recently as labourers and traders, it is equally a strong virtue to work for the solidarity and union of Muslims all over the world. If the Hindus in spite of their professions of pan-Hinduism can yet be considered nationalists there is no reason why Muslims should be banned as communalists when they display pan-Islamist leanings. If religion is the strongest appeal which has today succeeded in uniting Hindus in this vast sub-continent of India as it never did in the past for common political ideals, it is also the strongest force to

bring within its fold Muslims all over the world in the pursuit of common political aspirations.

Undoubtedly the Hindu claim to nationalism is based upon a common religious and cultural outlook and seeks further strength in the political ideals which it has borrowed from the West. In Europe religion has ceased to be a decisive factor in the grouping of nations as there is no conflict between one European State and another on the basis of religion. This is a natural consequence of the fact that all the European nations have a common religious outlook on life. There was a time when Europe was split up into hostile camps, led by Protestant and Roman Catholic States. But in course of time a spirit of toleration was developed and the sectarian differences which divided one Christian sect from another were recognised as different interpretations of the same religious order.

It is however a fact that Christian Europe has never tolerated so far the independent political existence of non-Christian States particularly those established by Muslims. The latest example is how Albania, a small Muslim State north of Greece was conquered and brought under her iron heel by Italy. No European statesman raised any protest in defence of this victimised Muslim State as Europe has never recognised so far the right to self-determination of people other than Christians. Hence it is still true to say that where the

interests of Christians and Muslims have come into conflict, Europe has always bowed down before the force of religion

This will be clearly illustrated by the policy which France the most democratic State of Europe, before the present war pursued in regard to Syria. For centuries the Muslims and Christians had lived together in Syria as citizens of a common native land. Though they differed in religion, yet they spoke the common Arabic language and were descended from the same stock. But French statesman, in open defiance of the Muslim demand for a united republic split up the country into two separate states, Syria proper for the Muslims and Lebanon for the Christians.

The same tendency was evident when the British Government had to deal with the Arab case in Palestine. But for the Muslim opposition, Palestine would have been divided into an Arab State and a Jewish State.

To a student of History who has followed the events of the past carefully, it is evident that Christian Europe has always kept the religious question in the background when disputes arose between one European State and another, but it has given it the first consideration when dealing with non-Christian States. Russia, France and England frequently interfered in the past in the internal administratio



of Turkey in the interest of the Christian minorities of the Ottoman Empire. Russia and France in particular always claimed to be the protectors of the life and property of the Armenian and Syrian Christians respectively. Hence the obvious lesson from the past is that Religion has been a unifying force in a country in the growth of nationalism among the followers of the same religion but it has been a disruptive force among the followers of different religions.

The Hindus in India recognise religion as a unifying force when the question of the social economical and political solidarity of the Hindu community comes in but they begin to minimise its effect and assign it a secondary place when the Muslims try to base their solidarity on religion. One may justly ask a Hindu what considerations move a Dravidian Madrasí, a brown faced Bengalee and a tall and fair coloured Punjabi to claim a common nationality except the consciousness that they have a common historical and cultural past. India is sacred to Hindus not because it is the home of Hindus and Muslims but because it is the birth place of their religion. It is the land which has developed in the past the social customs and rites which now form Hinduism. There is far greater affinity between two Hindus even though living in two remote corners of India on the basis of common reli

gious aspirations than can ever be dreamed of between a Hindu and a Muslim though living as close neighbours. There is nothing common between a Punjabi and a Madras Hindu except that they are united in their outlook on life by the ties of a common religion. Racially, linguistically, physically, and geographically they are poles asunder. The Punjabi is a pure representative of the Aryan stock, while the Madras Hindu belongs to the Dravidian race. Again the Punjabi speaks a language which a Dravidian will never agree to learn, as was evident from the recent agitation when he opposed the teaching of Hindi in schools. Thus the two fundamental essentials of a nationality, *i.e.* common race and language, are lacking among the Hindus living in different parts of India, but they are united by a common cultural outlook on life which has been the result of the Hindu system of religion. Haridwar, Puri, Mathra, Dwarka are sacred to all Hindus, they all believe in the caste system, in the theory of birth and rebirth, in the doctrine of Karma and transmigration of souls, and all are at one in burning their dead and in observing a thousand other customs and ways which they have been practising from time immemorial.

Western nationalism is the result of the correlation of different causes which have come

to work together. Common religion, race, language and traditions have been the unifying forces in the National States of Europe but all these are lacking in India taken as a whole. Here religion is the only link which unites the people in different provinces among themselves. The Hindus of Bengal have nothing in common with those in Gujrat so far as their race, language, geography, physical features, dress and diet are concerned but they still feel that they are one as an appeal to their common sentiment can be made through religion. Thus if it is true to say that Hindu nationalism derives its main force from religion, it is equally true to say that Muslim nationalism can only become strong if it is based on religion. A national movement, if it is genuine, is essentially spiritual in character and can only be achieved through a common religion which in the case of a country like India is also responsible for common language and literature, common history and traditions, common political ideals and aspirations. Hindus and Muslims in India are divided into two distinct groups on all major issues that normally separate one nation from another. The mere fact that Hindu leaders condemn pan-Islamism while encouraging pan-Hinduism in itself furnishes a clear proof that Hindu-Muslim differences can never be reconciled.

### 3 MOTIVES BEHIND CONGRESS NATIONALISM

Congress leaders, when arguing their case for independence of their own conception, forget that they have to reckon with a 100 million Muslims who are equally interested in the achieving of independence in so far as it will affect their rights and interests. Only the approach to the question is different.

For a Hindu whose nationalism is another name for Pan-Hinduism, it is easy to reconcile his conception of independence and religion. There is no conflict in his mind as to his duties towards his country and Dharma. Nationalism for him is synonymous with the revival of ancient Hindu civilisation and all that Hinduism stands for. It strengthens his desires to lay emphasis on those aspects of Hindu life which are in keeping with his past traditions.

He seeks inspiration from the example of Hindu heroes and divines who defended and fought for Hindu rights and interests in the past. Sivaji's name for him is a symbol for the successful revolt of Hindus against the Mughul rule. Pirthi Raj, Rana Partap Singh, Banda and a host of other Hindu warriors recall to his mind the days when Hindus struggled for the preservation of their liberties from Muslim domin-

to work together Common religion race language and traditions have been the unifying forces in the National States of Europe but all these are lacking in India taken as a whole Here religion is the only link which unites the people in different provinces among themselves The Hindus of Bengal have nothing in common with those in Gujrat so far as their race language geography physical features dress and diet are concerned but they still feel that they are one as an appeal to their common sentiment can be made through religion Thus if it is true to say that Hindu nationalism derives its main force from religion it is equally true to say that Muslim nationalism can only become strong if it is based on religion A national movement, if it is genuine is essentially spiritual in character and can only be achieved through a common religion which in the case of a country like India is also responsible for common language and literature, common history and traditions common political ideals and aspirations Hindus and Muslims in India are divided into two distinct groups on all major issues that normally separate one nation from another The mere fact that Hindu leaders condemn pan-Islamism while encouraging pan-Hinduism in itself furnishes a clear proof that Hindu-Muslim differences can never be reconciled

### 3 MOTIVES BEHIND CONGRESS NATIONALISM

Congress leaders, when arguing their case for independence of their own conception, forget that they have to reckon with a 100 million Muslims who are equally interested in the achieving of independence in so far as it will affect their rights and interests. Only the approach to the question is different.

For a Hindu whose nationalism is another name for Pan-Hinduism, it is easy to reconcile his conception of independence and religion. There is no conflict in his mind as to his duties towards his country and Dharma. Nationalism for him is synonymous with the revival of ancient Hindu civilisation and all that Hinduism stands for. It strengthens his desires to lay emphasis on those aspects of Hindu life which are in keeping with his past traditions.

He seeks inspiration from the example of Hindu heroes and divines who defended and fought for Hindu rights and interests in the past. Sivaji's name for him is a symbol for the successful revolt of Hindus against the Mughul rule. Pirthi Raj, Rana Partap Singh, Banda and a host of other Hindu warriors recall to his mind the days when Hindus struggled for the preservation of their liberties from Muslim domin-

ation. Mohammad bin Qasim Mahmud Ghaznavi Shahab-ud-Din Ghorī Mohammad Ibne Bakhtiar and numerous other Muslim generals and kings are in his opinion marauders and plunderers whose sole aim was to rob and destroy Hindu society

Emphasis on Hindi is solely laid on the supposed ground that Urdu is a language of the Muslims and it becomes thus both a religious and national duty for a Hindu to propagate the Hindi language and literature. Untouchability is recognised as an evil not because the caste system itself which is primarily responsible for it is condemnable but because it separates an important element from the fold of Hindu society and thus affects its political rights. In fact the urge for the uplift of Harijans derives its main force from the fact that it is the only way to preserve Hindu domination in India. A democratic system of Government implies a majority Government where the decisive factor on every important question is the counting of heads. The reclaiming of Harijans in the Hindu fold is thus both a religious and national duty.

Non Violence is an important item in the Congress programme. Its adoption as an article of faith serves religious as well as national interests. Politically it is an effective weapon to disarm communal suspicion and to deceive the minorities as well as the world into believ

ing that Indian nationalism is passive in its object and its sole aim is the emancipation of India. As Pt Nehru has said, "Ours is the nationalism of a subject people which is quite different from the aggressive nationalism of the West."

But those who know that the Congress High Command was working like a Fascist Organisation under the dictatorship of Mr. Gandhi cannot accept Pt Nehru's assurances. Every national movement at the start of its career pretends to be non-aggressive, but as soon as circumstances favour it, it seeks expansion at the cost of its weaker neighbours. Mr. Gandhi has so often said in the past that the Congress, being a non-violent organisation, should remain above suspicion and should never do a single act which may imply coercion on its part to dictate its terms. The essence of non-violence is to convert your enemy by an appeal to his reason and sentiment. But in practice, the Congress has resorted to non-violence on occasions when its action, besides bringing it into conflict with the Government, was considered an open challenge by the Muslims as well.

There is no difference between violence and non-violence when the object is to overawe your adversary into submission. Suppose the Hindus under the guidance of Mr. Gandhi resolve to carry on a non-violent struggle



against the Muslims with a view to force them to give up their demand for Pakistan. Will it be defensible on moral ground? Is it not possible for the struggle to develop even within the limits of non violence into an economic and social boycott of Muslims in Muslim minority Provinces? Only some 2½ years back when there were disturbance in Sind Mr Kirpalani threatened the economic boycott of Muslims if they would not come to their senses while the sage of Wardah advised the mass emigration of Hindus if they could not defend themselves violently or non violently

Mr Gandhi at first said to the Hindus of Sind "If they have not the capacity for non violent resistance they should learn the art of defending themselves. It does not require a strong body it requires a stout heart, cowardice should have no place in the national dictionary." Subsequently when the Hindus protested against his advice of mass emigration he modified it in these words "My advice is meant for those who though they are conscious of self respect lack the strength that comes from non violence or the capacity to return blow for blow. The advice was thus a direct incitement to violence by Hindus and failing that they were to leave the country and seek protection with their Hindu co religionists in the rest of India. The protagonists of a common India nation forget at the time that both

Muslims and Hindus according to his-professed conception, were an integral part of the Indian nation and he could not favour the one against the other. If the Hindus in Sind could claim his advice and sympathies, the Muslims were equally entitled to claim his attention as the root cause of the Sind disturbances lay in the aggressive attitude of Hindus towards Muslims

It will be thus evident that Mr Gandhi's non-violence has failed to convince Muslims of its moral justification. Far from disarming their suspicions it has roused their bitter hostility towards it. They consider it a cloak on the part of Congress to conceal its sinister motives of aggrandisement. As the Hindus are weak in the military sense, they have no other alternative but to adopt it till such time that they are sufficiently organised for an armed rebellion.

The weapon, has served two purposes from the Hindu standpoint. It has consolidated Hindu society on the basis of a new creed which in the hands of a clever politician like Mahatma Gandhi has been given the force of a religion. Mr Gandhi is never tired of proclaiming that he will change the existing order through his creed of non-violence. The more he lays emphasis on it, the more it is proved to be a part and parcel of the Hindu Dharma.

The second advantage from the Hindu point is that non-violence has practically curbed the martial spirit of the Muslims in the Frontier Province and has removed the danger of an effective resistance from the Pathans once Congress rule is established in India. If you keep on infusing into the minds of people bred up in military traditions and acquainted with the use of arms that their rights can best be defended by non violence that it is a sin to fight violently for the protection of their rights and that they should look to Mr Gandhi alone for guidance and advice in all political matters you are actually turning them into cowards and isolating them from past traditions. The Hindus have nothing to lose by the adoption of non violence for they have remained a subject race so long that they cannot learn the art of self defence through violence in a day. They must have a period of training before wresting power and this they can only do by uniting and consolidating on the basis of common allegiance to Mr Gandhi.

The world is led to believe that Mr Gandhi is a pacifist and hates all wars the Congress is a non-violent organisation and is striving for independence without causing bloodshed and loss of life and property in the country. The Government is told that Mr Gandhi will not purchase his country's freedom by violence that the Congress wants a true

democracy on the basis of non-violence, that India's independence is meant to help the allied Nations and in the common good of all classes of people. The Muslims are told that the Congress has no ill-will towards the minorities, that the absolute protection of their rights is a greater concern of the Congress than of the Government, and that after the attainment of independence their differences with Hindus will be settled through a Constituent Assembly or in case of disagreement by arbitration.

All these are fair promises, which are deliberately made to disarm opposition for the time being. The real intentions of the Hindus are evident from the open declaration of Hindu Mahasabha leaders that Swaraj means Hindu Raj where Muslims will be treated as the Jews were in Germany. The Congress professes the same thing but in a different way. Mr. Patel recently said that no constitution would be acceptable to the Congress unless it was based on the theory of a single nation. Mr. Gandhi refuses to confer with Mr. Jinnah as a Hindu as His Hinduism "includes all religions". The Congress has committed itself to India's unity, integrity and indivisibility in a special resolution and has closed the door for the consideration of Muslim political aspirations. Its opposition to Rajaji was mainly based on the ground that he pleaded the right of self-determination for Muslims.

It is clear that in face of such an uncom promising and aggressive attitude on the part of Hindus Muslims can never agree to accept their domination. The League has given them a new hope a new ideal and a new programme in life. Pakistan has furnished them an ideal which reconciles their religious and national sentiments. There is no longer any conflict in their mind as to their duty towards their country and their religion. Muslim homelands lie in two distinct Zones of India in the North-West and North East, and the liberation of these from the British as well as Hindu domination is the be-all and end-all of their efforts. The rest of Hindu India is no concern of theirs to defend or fight for just as it is no concern of Hindus to fight for the attainment of Pakistan by Muslims.

If the Congress fight for independence is viewed in this light, their true motives will be easily understood. So long as Congress claims to represent the whole of India as the home of a single nation and does not care to assure the Muslims of their right to self determination its fight for independence can only be interpreted as a fight for Hindu domination and hence it will fail to enlist Muslim sympathies. But if the Congress cares for a joint

fight, it must have a final settlement with Muslims as an essential condition precedent to freedom and give up the use of such provoking slogans as "Freedom will lead to unity." Nothing but civil war will result if the Congress undertakes direct action in defiance of Muslim aspirations

promotion of industries could appeal to the people to prefer unity to disintegration

The collapse of the Empire at the end of the Great War gave birth to a tremendous outburst of nationalism among all its national groups Czecho Slovakia Hungary and Austria became independent national states while parts of the Dual Monarchy were merged in the new States of Poland and Yugo-Slavia and the old State of Rumania

It is evident to a student of history that the problem of Austro Hungarian Empire could be tackled in a different way as well The various national groups could have been federated so as to form a federal State with complete provincial autonomy to federating parts The ground work for this already existed in the very name of the empire which was known as a Dual Monarchy with Austria and Hungary as its main parts The various peoples Czechs, Slovaks Poles Croats, Slavonese Rumanians Magyars and Germans all enjoyed a sort of provincial autonomy and were represented in the central parliaments to Vienna and Budapest The empire was united for defence and foreign affairs under the House of Hapsburg but for all other purposes both Austria and Hungary enjoyed complete independence

The advantages for federation might have outweighed those for separation but the

various peoples preferred the maxim. "Better a bad government by your own people than a good government by others" The people were encouraged in their demand for separation by the principle of self-determination which had been accepted in the Veisailles Conference for the settlement of claims of minorities living in compact areas and capable of forming independent States

The Turkish Empire too was a collection of many nationalities Nationalism proved a disruptive force here as well. In vain did the Young Turks try to create a national consciousness among the various peoples They set up a Committee of Union and Progress and promised equal rights to Christians, Jews, and other non-Turkish races

The movement for unity at first spread among all classes of people The Jew and the Greek fraternised with the Turk and even financed the movement. In the first national parliament of Turkey, the representatives of all religious and racial groups were summoned, and a new constitution was proclaimed which promised protection of religion, language and culture as well as full share in the enjoyment of political and civic rights to Muslims and non-Muslims alike. The experiment however, failed as it was bound to fail

The Arabs, the Armenians the Greeks, the Kurds and other minorities kept on intrigu-



ing for separation and did not rest content till Turkey was reduced to its original homeland of Asia Minor where the Turks formed a majority of the population. Here too the minority problem confronted Turkey. Besides 9½ million Turks in Asia minor there were a million each of Greeks, Armenians and Kurds. It was the presence of these minorities that was primarily responsible for the decision of the Allies to hand over Smyrna (and its hinterland) to Greece and to create an independent state of Armenia in the east. It was not until the Greeks and Armenians had either been driven or exchanged in population that Turkey became a truly homogeneous state.

Even now Turkey has to face trouble from time to time in the Eastern border where a million Kurds live.

It is interesting to note here that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru feels sympathy for the poor lot of these Kurds and wishes to see an independent Kurdish state. Beyond India a Congress nationalist is prepared to support all movements for separation and independence though they may stand no comparison with a similar movement which the Indian Muslims are sponsoring under Pakistan and other national schemes but inside India he will deny the existence of any but a single nation.

In a resolution passed by the Bengal Congressites under the guidance of Bose Brothers

the Congress invoked the principle of self-determination as applied in the case of Sudetan Germans and claimed its application for India as a whole. One could easily understand the sympathy of Congress leaders with the Sudetan Germans who persisted in their separation despite the assurances of full protection of all their political, economic, and cultural rights, but one fails to understand why the Indian Muslims are deprived of the right to determine their future and are being forced to accept the idea of a common nationality. The example of Kurds, whom Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru so much admires for their struggle for independence, all the more inspires Muslims to follow in their wake.

If the Kurds cannot remain content with Turkey, and continue to press for their independence on religious and national grounds, the Indian Muslim has still greater grounds for the justification of his cause. The Kurd is a staunch Muslim and he is mainly opposed to Turkish rule because he considers it irreligious. It is this motive which united the political and religious leaders of the Kurds to rise against Turkey frequently.

Now I quote here from Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru who thus states the Kurdish case in "The Glimpses of World History."

"Out of altogether 30 lacs of Kurds nearly half still lived in Turkey proper. A modern

nationalist movement had begun there soon after the Young Turk Revolution of 1908. Even at the Versailles Peace Conference Kurdish representatives had demanded national independence.

It is clear however that religious orthodoxy had much to do with the rising and it is equally clear that Kurdish nationalism had also much to do with it. Probably the nationalist motive was the strongest.

"Kemal Pasha crushed the Kurds without pity and set up special Tribunals of Independence. The Kurdish leaders Sheikh Said and Doctor Fuad and many others were executed. They died with the plea for the independence of Kurdistan on their lips.

So the Turks who had recently been fighting for their freedom crushed the Kurds who sought theirs. It is strange how a defensive nationalism develops into an aggressive one and a fight for freedom becomes one for domination over others. In 1929 there was a revolt of the Kurds and again it was crushed for the time being at least. But how can one crush for ever a people who insist on freedom and are prepared to pay the price for it."

This shedding of crocodile tears for the cause of Kurdish independence does not impress an Indian Muslim. The Kurds are an insignificant minority of a million in Turkey.

they do not occupy a compact area with distinct geographical limits, they are assured of full political and economic rights in the Turkish State. Their religion and culture stand in no danger in Turkey as the Turks are Muslim by religion.

One thing however is clear. If the movement for Kurdish independence can be termed a modern national movement as Pt Jawaharlal believes it to be, then the separation movement of Indian Muslims is a thousand times more a national movement. The lot of Indian Muslims will be far worse than those of Kurds if they were forced to accept the idea of a single composite nationality.

Now I turn to Russia. Here too, growth of nationalism at first coincided with the policy of Russification which the Czars had encouraged but in course of time disruptive tendencies arose. The peoples of the Western border, Finns, Esthonians, Latvians, Lithuanians and Poles clamoured for independence and finally succeeded in breaking off on the collapse of the Russian Empire. Those still left in the old Russian Empire, could no longer find any inspiration in the old idea of nationalism and developed a new cult, popularly known as Bolshevism, to unite the heterogenous elements of the Russian population. In fact the Bolshevik success was entirely due to their open discouragement of nationalism. The new appeal

was based upon the common interests of the workers and peasants in all parts of the world

The present day Soviet Russia is still not a national State in theory nor do the various peoples there have any faith in the idea of a single composite nationality as the Congress propagates in India. The Muslims in Turkistan and Trans-Caucasia could never have accepted the Soviet regime if the Bolshevik leaders had laid emphasis on nationalism.

The Soviet Constitution recognises all the national groups has given them complete provincial autonomy in their respective areas and has constituted a Council of nationalities in the Centre to safeguard the interests of various groups. Further the constitution recognises the right of each group for separation if its interests so demand. Despite however the protection of the cultural and economic interests of the various minorities in Russia, they are not yet contented.

The Muslims who form a national group of 18 millions in Central Asia and are one by language race and religion have been split up into five small Soviet republics to counteract the growth of nationalism and movement for separation among them. The Russians still are united under the Russian Federated Republic which claims more than 75 per cent of area and population. It is this artificial device

which has made the working of Soviet machinery smooth and possible. Out of the 11 constituent republics of Soviet Russia, six are Muslim republics but these are helpless against the Russian Federated Republic as they have not so far been allowed to merge into a single united republic. From the examples of the Austro-Hungarian, Turkish and Russian Empires, it is obvious that nationalism, instead of proving a unifying force, has been disruptive in its effect. The separatists in these countries could not be condemned as being narrow and communal in their outlook, nor could the idea of a common nationality be enforced upon them against their wishes.

The lesson of past history is that nationalism has failed to unite a people who are divided by race, religion or historic traditions. We are most often acquainted with the growth of nationalism on the basis of race or historic traditions and have consequently ignored religion as also one of the decisive factors in forming a nation.

Our misunderstanding is primarily due to the fact that the Western nations are all one by religion and are united by a common outlook on life. Religion has ceased to be a force for them as it no longer conflicts in their case with other religions.

There was, however, a time when

religion was a decisive force in Europe. In Spain the Muslims and Christians lived for over 700 years together but they were only welded into a common nation when Muslims had either been forcibly converted or driven out.

In the various Balkan States Muslims and Christians lived together for centuries under Turkish rule but with the rise of modern nationalism Muslims were deprived of all political share in the new States and assigned the status of minorities. Similar was the fate of Muslims in Russia.

Nationalism in pre-War Russia was understood to mean a national State of Christian Russians who were to dominate the Muslims and Jews as subject people. Europe does not furnish a single example where in the past attempts were ever made by a Christian State to admit the Muslims to equal political rights even though they were of the same stock and blood as the native Christians were. Thus where Europe has failed despite its professions of liberalism and toleration to furnish a single example of a composite Christian Muslim State coming into existence. India with its diversity of races, religions and languages has no chance to develop into a national State. Europe missed three clear opportunities of welding together Christian

and Muslims in Spain, the Balkan States, and Russia and on each occasion the aggressors were the Christian nationalists who had made nationalism a close preserve of Christianity

Even now where conflicts of religion are common, nationalism has failed to make its way. The Kurds and Armenians belong to the same stock and speak the same language, yet it is religion alone which has kept a dividing line between the two communities. The Irish in Roman Catholic Ireland and those in Ulster are only divided into two separate States on account of religion. The Muslim Bulgars in Bulgaria form more than 10 per cent of the population and yet they have not been reconciled with the Christian rule and would even now welcome a return to Turkey if that were possible for them. Thus religion is always the strongest force in determining national consciousness wherever representatives of two different religions come into contact in a fairly large area and have distinct culture, history and traditions of their own.

Europe for the most part never saw the clash of religions, so it was possible for it to develop racial or territorial States. In Southern Europe where the possibility of Christians and Muslims developing into composite nations presented itself, in Spain, the



Balkan Peninsula, and parts of Italy aggressive wave of Christian nationalism suppressed it once for all and all Muslim influence was finally extirpated

Here it is necessary to refute an objection as to whether change of religion implies change of nationality. If nationality is determined by religion change of religion certainly implies change of nationality. But if in a country like England it is determined by racial and other historic factors then change of religion may not imply a change of nationality as understood in the west, but it does imply a fundamental change if the new convert is a Muslim.

An Englishman by accepting Islam does find an essential change in his complete outlook on life. He is no longer permitted to intermarry or even interdine with his Christian countrymen if he suspects pork being served. He cannot transfer his property to a Christian nor can he support his Government if it carries on a war of aggression against a Muslim State. He has far greater sympathies for Muslims of other parts of the world than even his own relatives who are Christians. He may under necessity be called an Englishman but in reality he is the member of a higher nation the Islamic Brotherhood which recognises no geographical limits or the bars of colour race or language.

Mahatma Gandhi is misinformed in supposing that a Muslim can be persuaded or compelled to subordinate the interests of his community, which has a distinct culture and outlook on life, to those of an aggressive kind of nationalism which in practice means the domination of Hindu culture and thought.

In India, there is not merely the clash of religions in the narrow sense of the word, there is clash in every aspect of life, political, social, cultural and economic.

Here is the evidence of the Simon Commission Report, which thus describes Hindu-Muslim differences :

"It would be utter misapprehension to suppose that Hindu-Muslim antagonism is analogous to the separation between religious denominations in contemporary Europe. Differences of race, a different system of law, and the absence of inter-marriage constitute a far more effective barrier. It is a basic opposition manifesting itself at every turn in social custom and economic competition as well as in mutual religious antipathy."

## 5 ONE-NATION MYTH EXPOSED

Mr Gandhi in an article in the "Harijan" blows cold and hot in the same breath. He admits that "the Muslims must have the same right of self determination that the rest of India has. We are at present a joint family. Any member may claim a division. His inconsistency however becomes apparent when he assumes the role of a high prophet for Muslims and calls the two nation theory an untruth. To repeat his own words

But I do not believe that Muslims when it comes to a matter of actual decision will ever want vivisection. Their good sense will prevent them their self-interest will deter them and their religion will forbid the obvious suicide which partition would mean. The two-nation theory is an untruth." In the end he warns the Muslims against "the untruth that is being propagated amongst them. He says "This warning is a duty because I have faithfully served them in their hour of need and because Hindu Muslim unity has been and is my life's ambition."

An attempt will be made here to examine the arguments advanced by Mr Gandhi to prove how far they are based on real facts. The first argument is that 'the vast majority

of Muslims of India are converts to Islam or are descendants of converts. They did not become a separate nation as soon as they become converts." What Mr. Gandhi means to say in plain words is that change of religion does not imply change of nationality. According to him, people observing different religions can remain members of the same nation.

He has, however, lost sight of two important facts. Firstly, the conception in the relations between religion and nationality differs in the East from that in the West. Religion is considered not merely religion, in the strict sense as understood in the West, by a Hindu or a Muslim, but a complete social code which affects all the activities of life. In Islam, religion is the motive spring of all actions in life. A Muslim of one country has far more sympathies with a Muslim living in another country than with a non-Muslim living in the same country.

The Prophet of Arabia (blessed be his soul) loved Balal, an Ethiopian, more than his own kindred who had not yet accepted Islam. Even now an Indian Muslim feels far more stirred by the distress of his Muslim brothers beyond India than by a similar calamity affecting non-Muslims in India does not imply that Islam teaches indifference towards other religions, but it is simply a proof of the brotherhood of Islam wherein all those holding similar views

develop an identical interest in the future outlook on life and consequently are moved to feel a genuine sympathy in the welfare of Muslims in general

How this force of religion can be exercised in opposition to the idea of nationality can be explained by a typical example. A German nationalist will take pride in the exaltation of his own country and will spare no efforts to advance its interests, though they may directly result in doing harm to another country. But if he becomes a convert to Islam and he is true to his religion he will have to modify this conception of nationality so far as his relations are concerned with Muslims. If his country wages a war with a Muslim country for aggressive purposes it shall be his religious duty no matter what the dictates of nationality may demand to oppose his country as far as it lies in his power and to withhold all active support from it. Thus the mere conversion of a German to Islam tremendously affects his relations with the Muslims in general

Mr Gandhi should know that in cases where there is a conflict between duty towards religion and duty towards nation a Muslim will always prefer the former and discard the role of a nationalist in the broader interests of Islam. A Muslim cannot reconcile his allegiance permanently to the theory of a single nation wherein he is required to merge his identity and

lose contact with his religion as a dominating force or with the Muslim in other parts of the world

The second point which Mr. Gandhi has ignored is that religion alone is a cohesive force for the idea of nationality. In countries where the allegiance of people is divided on the basis of religion, the idea of a single nationality has never finally succeeded. In Germany, the Christians and Jews have lived together for centuries and yet they have failed to weld together into a single nation. The Nazis have only recently discovered a remedy, by concentrating Jews in a separate homeland in the central part of Poland.

The Muslims and Christians lived together for more than 800 years in Spain and yet the idea of a single nationality could not be developed. It was only when the Muslims had been driven out of the country or had been forcibly converted to Christianity that the modern Spanish nation came into existence.

Very often in the fold of the same religion, marked differences in views have led to the division of a nation into two or more parts. In Ireland the Protestant Ulster men and the Roman Catholic Irishmen do not wish to form a common national State. The Dutch and the Belgians are very small peoples who could easily be united into a single nation but it was mainly the religious differences that led to the final

separation of the two countries. The Belgians are Roman Catholic by religion and the Dutch are Protestants. The present conception of nationality in Europe does not lay emphasis on religion as this factor acts unnoticed as a unifying force in every European state and does not come in conflict with the other interests of the people in general.

Europe has not so far tolerated the government of any other nation unless it be Christian by religion. Islam came into contact with Christians in various parts of Europe and established successful governments in Spain, South Italy and Sicily, the Balkan Peninsula and Southern Russia. So long as the aggressive wave of Christian nationalism was held in abeyance, the Muslims managed to preserve their religion and culture, but with the regeneration of Modern Europe in the 16th century a general crusade began against Muslim settlers in all parts of Europe. The Pope as head of the Roman Catholic Church supported the Spanish Inquisition and other measures for the extirpation of Muslim influence from Europe while the Czars of Russia as heads of the Greek Catholic Church drove out Muslims from the Southern provinces and exercised a reign of complete tyranny over those Muslims who were still left under Russian rule. In fact the Muslims were never considered as equal in status to Christians and were deprived of the

common rights of citizenship. Thus where Christian Europe has failed, in spite of its professions of liberalism, to evolve a common nationality with Muslims or Jews, how can the Muslims trust, in face of this bitter experience of the past, that the Hindus will prove more generous and will extend to them an equal status in political, economic and social aspects?

There are far more grounds for the Muslims to mistrust Hindus than Christians. Inter-marrying and inter-dining were a possibility between a Muslim and Christian, while both religions recognise no untouchability or caste system. Again in their future outlook on life, in their conception of kingdom of God and brotherhood of man, in their belief in Revealed Religions and in various other ways there are far closer affinities between the two, but it is the plain verdict of History that Christianity in Europe has never tolerated Islam under its government while Muslims in their countries have preserved intact the various Christian nationalities.

The Christian Copts in Egypt, the Armenians in Turkey, the Jews in Palestine have lived under Muslim rule for more than a thousand years without a break, and yet during all this time they were treated as separate nationalities entitled to full rights along with Muslims. Can there be a single example where a Muslim minority has been treated in a European cou



with equal magnanimity? The fate of Muslims in Albania and South Russia is even now an eye opener. The Muslims in these countries are being rapidly extirpated and replaced by Italian and Russian settlers.

Who can say that the Hindus in a future India where they will have the full rights of a sovereign power at the Centre may not repeat the same tactics and colonise those sparsely populated Muslim parts of India where there is yet abundant scope for surplus population? The peaceful penetration of the Hindu Bania under British protection is even now steadily progressing in the pure Muslim areas of the North West. In cities like Bannu Dera Ghazi Khan and Quetta where the surrounding districts are purely inhabited by Muslims, Hindus still dominate the urban life in ever increasing numbers and control all the venues of profit and trade. Unless the Muslims press for separation immediately from the rest of India there is danger that the future Federal Government may take up the question of migration in its own hands and finance schemes of colonisation in Sind and the Punjab with a view to settle the starving people of Rajputana or the growing surplus population of the United Provinces in these areas.

Mr. Gandhi advances his second argument on the basis of affinity of language dress food etc., between a Muslim and a Hindu. He

writes thus, "A Bengali Muslim speak the same tongue that a Bengali Hindu does, eats the same food, has the same amusements as his Hindu neighbour They dress alike I have often found it difficult to distinguish by outward sign between Bengali Hindu and a Bengali Muslim The same phenomenon is observed more or less in the south among the poor who constitute the masses of India "

*Definitely up to date*  
 Here again the Mahatma relies upon premises which are illusory, Affinity of language, dress, food, etc, alone does not form a sure basis, for the growth of a single nation It can be proved by various instances from Europe that these conditions exist in a far more effective manner among the people inhabiting the various parts of Europe and yet they are separate nations "The French and the Italians," in the words of M Bonner, "are linked by ties of blood, culture and religion," and yet they are poles asunder politically The Portuguese and the Spaniards are both descended from the same stock, live in the same country with natural sea-boundaries on three sides and the mountain frontier on one side, speak allied languages of the same origin, and have had a common historical past for over 700 years under Muslim rule Both these peoples are Roman Catholic by religion, observe common social customs and traditions and have developed common economic interests In colonial

ing South America in liberating their country from the Muslim yoke and for carrying on a relentless war against Muslim States their interests never clashed in the 16th and 17th centuries, and yet they have failed to develop into a united national State

Like the Indian peoples they were united against what they regarded as their common danger in the rising power of Islam and they fought side by side with this object in view. But as soon as they were freed from Muslim rule, they developed separate national States of their own. If the threat of common danger could not unite two sister communities of the same religion, race and culture, there is no reason how the common fight against British Imperialism could unite the Indian peoples once for all. Independence no doubt was the goal of the Portuguese and Spaniards when they fought against their Muslim masters, but once this goal was achieved they turned to defend their respective interests and were not reconciled till they were finally separated in national States of their own.

So far as food, dress, amusements etc., are concerned there is practically no difference between one European and another or even between a German and an Englishman. You cannot recognise by personal appearance whether a certain European is an Englishman, French, German or Italian unless you enquire

it from him. Even a modern Turk will not be recognised on account of his European dress, unless he declares it so. The real test of nationality is not an outward sign which may or may not exist, but the desire on the part of the members of a nation to group themselves under a separate government of their own, provided they are a compact majority in a compact part of land. No geographical frontiers or administrative difficulties can stand as permanent obstacles in the way of the natural desire of a people to determine their own government.

The oneness of India to-day is an artificial creation of British rule for its own imperial interests. So even in the past whenever the unity of India was achieved under the rule of a king, it was only meant for imperialistic purposes. The fact that India is a single geographical unit at present, does not mean that it cannot be split up into two or more States. Are not the Iberian Peninsula, Scandinavia, the Balkan Peninsula, and European Russia single geographical units? And yet all of them are the homes of two or more nations.

Mr Gandhi in an emotional mood writes in another place "And is Islam such an exclusive religion as the Qaid-i-Azam would have it? Is there nothing in common between Islam and Hinduism or any other religion? Or is Islam merely an enemy of Hinduism." Here

again he has deliberately tried to misread the situation. The Christian Armenians and Muslim Kurds have lived together for centuries speak the same language eat the same food wear the same dress and observe many common social customs and yet they are not prepared to live under the rule of people other than their own or to weld together into a single nation. The Armenians have been given a separate homeland in the new republic of Armenia. This however does not mean that Islam is an enemy of Christianity or that there is nothing in common between a Muslim and a Christian.

The issue before the Muslims is whether in any country or compact part of a country where they are a solid majority they should have the status of an independent nation or a mere majority depending upon the good will and protection of others. Muslim history has given one and only one reply to this question. The Muslims will never forego their majority rights or even their individuality as Muslims for any consideration however weighty it may be.

Take the case of a small country like Albania in Europe. The Muslims form a majority of 70% in Albania. As long as their interests were secure under the Turkish Empire they remained content but once his Empire collapsed and they were left to

their fate, they decided to form an independent State of their own and chose a Muslim King, though they had far greater chances of security and protection if they had merged into the Sebian or Greek nations with whom they had much in common. They, however, steadily refused these considerations and preferred to lose their independence rather than give up their identity as a separate Muslim people. The Italian rule which has ushered in a reign of tyranny has failed to curb their spirit.

Exactly has been the case of Muslims in Chinese Turkistan. They are a helpless minority of three millions in the Chinese Empire, but, as they are settled in a compact province they have never been content with Chinese rule and have ever been on the look out for an opportunity to declare their independence. It is only the fear of Russian aggression from the west and the status quo policy of British Imperialism in Central Asia which has suppressed so far the Muslim aspirations for independence.

To think that the Muslims will be content with the status of a minority in the North-West and the North-East of India, where they form a majority of over 70% in population, is simply belying the lessons of Muslim History. If the 50 millions of Afghans, Persians and Turks can maintain

their separate independent existence, uninterfered with by others the Muslims with a population of 60 millions in their two predominant Zones in India have equal rights to claim their independence

The principle of territorial nationality lends an additional support to Muslim claims in these regions. The Muslims fail to understand the advantages which they can have by owing allegiance to a greater India where the Hindu majority will be permanently placed in power. Can Mr Gandhi suggest what will be the substitute for the loss of independent political power which the Muslims will suffer by placing Muslim Provinces under Hindu domination? How will the Muslims be reconciled to the loss of full control over the vital organs of a national state i.e. army navy air means of communications foreign affairs finance if these are finally transferred to a Central Government where the Muslims will always be in a minority? If a similar situation arose in another country say in the Iberian Peninsula and the Portuguese were asked to merge their identity into a bigger Spanish nation for the sake of unity democracy and federation would the Portuguese ever accept it? I leave the answer to Mr Gandhi

Muslims can easily follow the advice of Mr Gandhi in provinces where they are a

minority. They will willingly agree to remain content as members of a Hindu national State as long as their religious and cultural interests are protected. Muslim minorities have lived in the past in various parts of the world on the best of terms with the members of other religions. But they have never accepted the role of a minority whenever, in view of their numbers or physical strength, they felt themselves strong enough to form an independent Muslim State. This fact should always be borne in mind when dealing with Muslim problem in India.

Mr Jinnah has done a real service to Islam by presenting before the Muslims the ideal of a separate independent nation which in due course will lead to the formation of two sovereign States on the eastern and western borders of Hindu India. This movement for independent Muslim states in India will give a tremendous encouragement to similar movements in China and Russia where Muslims have so far been assigned the status of minorities.

In Central Asia, Muslims are a majority of 90% out of a population of 20 millions and yet at present they are kept under subjection by the Chinese and Soviet Governments.

Islamic political problems are everywhere of an allied nature. Liberation of one Muslim country will directly affect another. The fate



of Muslims in India will have direct repercussions in other parts of the world particularly in the Western Provinces of China and central Asia where Muslims are in a majority. Acceptance of minority status within the sub Continent of India will besides sealing once for all the fate of 90 million Muslims in India lead to permanent enslavement of 30 millions of Muslims in Soviet Russia and 50 millions in Western China.

It is quite natural to suppose that if India achieves independence as a united country under the aegis of Congress, it will enter in future into permanent alliance with China and Russia so as to keep the Muslims in the three countries under permanent domination. The creation of an independent Muslim State in Central Asia will always be viewed with suspicion by the future Congress Government in India as this will lead to the movement for separation among the Muslims in India as well. It is thus a great tribute to the statesmanship of Mr Jinnah that he has foreseen the future so clearly and has set in motion forces which will ultimately promote the cause of Muslim independence in India China, Central Asia and parts of Southern Russia

## 6. DANGERS OF AGGRESSIVE NATIONALISM

### [ I ]

Modern nationalism has the tendency to develop into Imperialism of the worst type. It can be proved by numerous examples that the cult of nationalism has always been followed by a desire for the exploitation of weaker peoples and has generally come into conflict with the interests of others.

True nationalism, as an ideal, has never been so far attained in any country with the exception of the Muslim States of the Middle East. Modern Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, and Iraq have no aggressive designs on their neighbours, though they have every moral right to reclaim lands of which they have been forcibly dispossessed. In view of the fact that they have strong arguments in their favour for territorial expansion, the conduct of these Muslim States is all the more commendable in exercising a general restraint on their political aspirations.

The Muslim press of these countries has always been a strong advocate of the right to self-determination of every nation, big or small,

and has never missed an opportunity to express its sympathies for the oppressed nations

The minorities in these Muslim countries are numerically very small, but still they command power and influence out of proportion to their numbers. The lot of Jews is every where enviable. There is no racial or religious prejudice which divides a Jew from a Muslim in these countries. The Zoroastrians of Iran the Nestorians of Iraq the Armenians and Greeks of Turkey—all enjoy the protection of their respective States and share in common with Muslims the benefits accruing from an ordered and progressive government. This happy change in the condition of minorities resulted from the separation of unnatural parts from the parent States.

Before the last war Turkey had double its present population and resources. But even then she could never enjoy eternal peace and security. The minorities of the old Turkish Empire were concentrated in certain compact areas, apart from being intermixed throughout the length and breadth of the Empire. The Greeks mustered strong in the Islands of the Aegean coast, while the Armenians claimed national homelands on the eastern border. The Arabs formed an overwhelming majority in the Southern Provinces of Iraq, Syria, Hejaz and Yemen.

The post-war settlement reduced the former limits of the Turkish Empire and separated all predominantly non-Turkish parts to form States of their own. Thus Syria, Iraq and Palestine came into existence as mandatory States. Greece and Armenia were allowed to exchange their nationals with those of Turkey as far as practicable.

As a result of these changes, the heterogeneous Turkish Empire of 1914 became the homeland of a single coherent nation in 1921 by a re-adjustment of its geographical frontiers. The Turks rose from the position of the ruling minority in the Empire to the position of the dominant majority which was free to manage its own affairs without interference from the European powers which had formerly assumed the role of Protectors of the Christian minorities of the Empire. A present Turkey has no minority problem to solve in the strict sense of the word—the Muslims numbering over 17½ millions as against less than half a million Christians and Jews.

For us in India, the minority question has assumed the same importance as it held in the former Turkish Empire. The nationalists in Turkey who had enlisted themselves as members of the Committee of Union and Progress, and stood for the unity, integrity and indivisibility of the old Ottoman Empire lost their fervour and zeal at the very first crucial test

they had to face. The Empire was shaken to its very foundation when the divergent interests of the various elements in population came into actual conflict

The Greeks Armenians and Arabs, all in turn worked secretly for dismemberment of the Empire which they were pledged to defend. The open revolt of the Arabs and Armenians shattered for ever the hopes of the Turkish nationalists who finally gave up the idea of a united nation and declared before the world that the Turks demanded nothing but the right to govern their own people in those parts of the Empire where they formed a majority

Mustapha Kemal Pasha later known as the Ataturk became the first exponent of this new mission of the Turkish people. He recognised the right to independent existence of the non Turkish peoples of the former Turkish Empire and abolished Caliphate which in his opinion was a survival of the old order when the Turkish Sultans claimed to exercise spiritual and temporal power on behalf of the Muslim World. The Turks have nobly stood by the true mission of their leader and have fraternised with all their neighbouring states as members of the same family

Turkish nationalism has proved to the letter that a self respecting community can hardly conceive that it exists for its own in

terests only. "A nation which exists for liberty order or any element of civilisation cannot be satisfied unless other nations too may share what is belived to be of value."

Our Congress friends in India have a real lesson to derive from the Turkish parallel. The Turks had lived together with Arabs for centuries as citizens of the same Empire. They benefited by a common system of government and law, acknowledged the House of Ottomans as the undisputed spiritual and temporal head of the Muslim world, shared together in the glorious achievements of the Empire and entertained the same political aspirations as to their future and, above all, were united by ties of religion, history and tradition. The desire for nationalism, instead of unifying the two peoples, gave them new and distinct characteristics and separated them for ever to develop in their own way.

If the fusion of Arabs and Turks has not been possible in any part of the Turkish Empire, how can it be possible to unite Hindus and Muslims as members of a single united nation which never existed in India in the past. The Hindus must recognise that nationalism, as they misinterpret it, is not always a unifying force. It has more often than not been a disruptive force.

Before the dawn of nationalism it was possible for various national or racial groups

to live under a common system of government and law. In modern times all attempts towards Imperialism are bound to fail in the long run. Abnormal circumstances may arise when a strong and powerful nation may suppress the liberties of weaker nations but the conquering nation will never for long keep its hold on the oppressed nation. A united Europe under the hegemony of Germany is as impossible of attainment as a united India at the dictates of the Congress.

Those who pin their hopes to a scheme of Federation, which in future will unite the nations of the world as members of the same family forget the essential condition that this ideal will always remain unworkable so long as every national group big or small which occupies a compact part of a territory is not conceded the right to self government according to its own peculiar conditions.

A nationalist in China may appeal to the moral force of world opinion in general in the fight for the liberation of his motherland but this appeal will always be misunderstood as long as millions of Muslims of the Chinese Empire are groaning under the tyranny of Chinese Imperialism. It is an apt question to ask what right have the Chinese nationalists to keep under abject subjection the Turkish Muslims of Chinese Turkistan who judged by every modern standard are entitled to full

national independence. No strategic or economic consideration can be held valid to deprive a people of their legitimate political rights

The Finns were a mere minority in the former Czarist Russia, but this factor could not be advanced as an argument against their national independence

Congress nationalists have every moral justification to work for the liberation of this vast sub-continent from foreign yoke but their actions will be misunderstood if they deny to others the application of the very principles which they claim for themselves. When it is admitted that Hindu-Muslim differences are fundamental and cannot be bridged over except by resort to force, why should we appeal to a third power for intervention and not meet together to adjust them in a spirit of compromise and accommodation ?

It is a recognised principle in Politics that where political differences have taken a serious turn and there is no hope of a mutual settlement, then the group desiring secession from the bigger unit, of which it has been kept a part, has every right to fight for its emancipation. This principle becomes still more binding in force where these differences divide the people in a non-homogeneous State

In a country inhabited by two or more distinct national groups the right to disruption



becomes a national duty for the group which occupies a compact part of territory and feels that its interests can better be served by separation than by union with other groups. In such a country the right of a majority to rule must always be limited by the right of a minority to secede.

## [ II ]

A true nationalist would support the promotion and development of the divergent traditions of different nations. He will recognise the differences that divide one group of men from the other and will lead to the ultimate good of humanity.

There is some special quality in every group of men or nationality which it will be in the interest of whole humanity to preserve and this will only be possible if the right of every nationality is recognised to develop its own laws and institutions. It is a clear verdict of history that when a nation has been deprived of its political independence it is demoralised to such an extent that it cannot contribute its due share in the progress of humanity. Conversely when a nation wins back its political independence its contribution to the progress of humanity becomes substantial and effective in proportion to its own importance.

Thus for example, the Muslims in their heyday of glory in Spain contributed in no small measure to the progress of the country in medicine, science, art and literature. But when on the decline of their political power they were driven out of the country or converted to Christianity, they lost all their zeal and energy in the pursuit of knowledge and learning and were reduced to the condition of serfs and slaves. Similarly, Muslims of India under the Sultanates of Delhi and the Moghul Emperors maintained a high level of progress according to the accepted standards of the time. In architecture, arts and crafts, music and poetry, they displayed a wonderful skill, while as soldiers, traders, and missionaries they were among the most enterprising people in the world. Again in wealth, education, industry and trade, they held their position fairly well against the sister community which then, as now, was in a majority.

The loss of political power meant to Muslims the loss of their best cherished traditions of virtue, honour and chivalry and they sank gradually into the position of an illiterate poverty-stricken and neglected minority. In the Punjab where they formed a majority, the tyranny and oppression of Sikh rule deprived them of all opportunities to make their influence felt. The present day condition of Indian Muslims is directly the result of loss of their

political power and their comparative slowness to adapt themselves to changed circumstances. If the Muslims again win back the power to rule over their own majority areas they will revive their old traditions of virtue and honour and develop afresh their art and literature institutions and laws from the points where their progress was abruptly stopped.

The world will be poorer if Hindus and Muslims are not permitted to promote and develop their respective cultures, creeds and laws on the lines of their own historic traditions and are forcibly united to develop a new culture or sense of unity which will be a mere imitation of the West and will lead finally to the destruction of all that is best in Muslim and Hindu systems of religion and polity. If it is conceded that Hindus and Muslims have their respective cultures which it is worthwhile to maintain then all efforts for unity will prove a failure. Iqbal is typically a Muslim poet while Tagore is a Hindu to the core. There is no meeting place between the two. One believes in the revival of ancient Hindu character and ethics while the other pins his faith to the regeneration of Muslim World.

You cannot unite the various nations of Europe on a political basis if you recognise that each has its own distinct culture to maintain. The differences in cultural aspects bet

ween one European nation and another are not so marked as in the case of the Hindus and the Muslims in India, and yet each is determined to pursue its own chosen course, irrespective of any material benefits that may be conferred on it by the fusion of its culture into that of another. The Swedes and the Norwegians, the Spaniards and the Portuguese, the Dutch and the Belgians, the Serbs and the Croats the Czechs and the Slovaks respectively inhabit, more or less, parts of the same countries with not very distinct geographical limits, yet none of these nations is prepared to give up its own laws and institutions in order to merge into those of the other.

In some important respects, almost all the nations of Europe have inherited certain common traditions. They all look upon Greece as their parent home for many of their notions of civilisation, art and philosophy. In the city of Rome and the old Roman Empire they seek tradition of unity, order and law which exercised a great influence in the past in developing character under the same system of law and Government. The Middle Ages furnish to them another link in the Church which, besides giving them a common religion, gave them a common system of education, under the strict supervision of the clergy. The Church tried to develop the political conception that the entire Christian Europe was the

Kingdom of God where the Pope acted both as Temporal and Spiritual Head. Then again all European countries owe much of their present day progress and awakening to the Age of Renaissance which ushered in an era of adventure and exploration both in the world of literature and geography.

Since the dawn of modern age Europe has displayed wonderful activity in the pursuit of knowledge art and science and in the expansion of industry trade and commerce. All their achievements are felt to be a common heritage of every European. Lastly the development of means of Communication has linked together the distant parts of Europe and has led to increasing social intercourse and economic inter dependence.

Despite all these factors Europe cannot be spoken of as one united nation nor is it possible to anticipate the tendency to union or even federation between any two countries or nationalities of Europe. The Finns and the people of the Baltic States on the western border of Russia nor again the people of Ulster in Ireland could ever be persuaded to accept union with their neighbouring States.

Thus if political unity of two or more European countries is an impossibility except under a threat of force even though there are important traditions common to all countries

it is utterly absurd to conceive of India's unity, especially when there are such marked difference in the cultures of the two major communities. Hindus and Muslims are poles asunder in their political aspirations in regard to their past, present and future. They have diametrically opposite systems of law and inheritance which prevent intermarrying and interdining. They derive inspiration from two entirely different quarters and observe a conflicting set of religious rites and practices—for example, the animal sacrifice of Muslims and the cow veneration of Hindus.

It is in plain recognition of these differences that a prominent political writer, D. Burns, has frankly declared that political liberty cannot be conceived for India as one single unit. He thus states his views: "For example, it is impossible to speak of the Indian Self-Government, as though India could be at present a unit having a simple relation to England. India is no more one than is Europe, and although there is growing up a general Indian sentiment, Self-government based upon an identity of interest between all the inhabitants of a continent is absurdly impracticable." A true nationalist believes in the right to political independence of other national groups just as he believes in that of his own. The attempt to make all groups alike by bringing them under a common system of law and

government will in his opinion destroy some special character of endurance or wit which may be developed even in a small nation

Another consideration which moves a true nationalist to support the cause of a nation not necessarily his own is the fact that no one political system is suited to the genius of every nation. States should vary in their law and government so as to reflect in their variety the distinct character of human groups. If all states were placed under a uniform system of law and government the tendency to assimilate due to the increasing means of communications will lead to the suppression of much that is good and drive the weaker states to imitate the virtues and vices of the dominant states.

The unification of the German Empire has not been an unmixed blessing. On the contrary it is said that by falling under the domination of Prussia, the Germans of the Southern States and the Rhine have lost much that was admirable in their character and they have imitated the vices of Prussian militarism.

Different political systems are at work in the world. What suits one country may not be workable in the peculiar circumstances of the other. Democracy of the Western type, with its trend towards capitalism is quite in its place for a rich manufacturing

country which has expanded beyond its limits or has ample scope within its own bounds for the development of its resources. Thus England, France, Belgium, Holland, Portugal and Denmark grew up into democratic States with Parliamentary institutions. All these states had ample scope for the exploitation of new lands in their possession beyond the mother country. So in course of time, the upper classes of these countries grew in power and wealth and turned their democratic institutions to their own best advantage. The condition of lower orders, the labourer in the field and factory, is still far from satisfactory but not so bad as in case of countries which have newly imitated parliamentary institutions and do not possess enough resources through lack of living space or undevelopment of natural wealth to promote the welfare of the people in general. This second set of states contains the new states of Europe that came into existence on the dismemberment of the former Russian, Turkish and Austro-Hungarian Empires. All these states were still extremely poor and democratic institutions, instead of being a source of hope and joy to the people, proved a great setback. These peoples had no parliamentary experience, nor had they acquired the necessary education to work out democratic institutions. Hence the administration came



into the hands of inefficient and corrupt men who through influence of wealth or family contrived to maintain their hold on the general body of electors. Democracy has thus proved a failure in many countries.

Even as a social order that once was held as the highest contributing factor to the future happiness of mankind democracy has its own limitations. In the increasing complexity of modern life where the State has to frame laws about a number of technical problems, the ordinary legislature cannot give an expert advice and so the work has to be left to a body of specialists who may not often be available with a Legislature elected on the principle of adult franchise. Democracy also sometimes moves very slowly in effecting new changes and reforms and even when it makes up its mind to carry the wishes of its people into practice it does not have an effective machinery to secure ready and prompt compliance with its orders. Its efforts are also hampered by the obstruction of labour unions and other organisations which derive their force from public opinion and are opposed to the state on party grounds. Originally it was conceived that a democratic government will be essentially a one party government where one party will form the Government and carry through its programme, while the other party will enter

into opposition and accept the role of a minority which will not try to hamper the work of the party in power beyond the criticism of its policy. But with the multiplicity of interests in a modern state, new parties arose and party affiliations became so slippery that it was found difficult to stabilise the government

In France, prior to its surrender, there was no one party in the Senate and the Chamber which could command the confidence of a majority of members. Hence coalition ministries had to be formed which changed rapidly with the shiftings of party members from one group to another. This weakened the Central Government and crippled its national will at a time when it should have commanded the undivided allegiance of the entire nation for its very existence.

It will be true evident that democracy cannot be transplanted in every soil and climate without regard to circumstances. In Saudi Arabia, Iran and Afghanistan, the idea is yet in the embryonic stage, and it will take years before the people will be used to it. Even then there is no guarantee that as the political consciousness of the people grows, they may not give it up in its present form, as understood in

the west, and may evolve a new form of it, based on purely Islamic conceptions

### [ III ]

India may safely be included in the list of those countries where Democracy will never meet with success as long as the present conditions of social inequality persist. The Hindus are a caste ridden people who have never known in the past any political conception besides that of a benevolent despotism. Their social order is a negation of democracy. They have deprived a quarter of their own population in this vast subcontinent of the ordinary privileges to which every man is entitled on the basis of equality of man. An untouchable can not touch a Hindu's food or drink water from the same well or even worship in the same temple. He is held in the lowest scale in society. Centuries of observance of caste system have developed an exclusive outlook among the Hindus in general against the depressed classes. It is not an easy task to eradicate these social differences.

Other factors which are a permanent impediment in the successful working of a democratic form of government in India taken as a single political unit, are —

(1) The Hindu-Muslim problem cannot be solved within the framework of nationalism as conceived by the majority community and (2) The vastness of India's area and population with its diversity of races, religions and languages makes it impossible for a democratic form of government to reconcile the conflicting interests and prejudices of the heterogeneous mass of peoples.

As a famous American writer has said "Democracy prospers in societies with a fairly simple political and economic organisation in which the issues at stake are not complex and lend themselves to clear-cut discussions in representative assemblies Democracy presupposes readiness on the part of the majority in parliament or outside to give the minority to accept the policies of the majority as long as the latter holds power Continuing his argument the same writer thus concludes "Where the disposition to rational discussion of fundamental problems is lacking, where differences between political or economic groups appear irreconcilable, where these groups prefer to fight out the ultimate issues involved rather than effect a compromise where a continuing state of crisis of emergency, exists—democracy no longer functions with success and must sooner or later yield to some other form of government."

The establishment of the Soviet Government in Russia after the last war and of Fascism in Spain can be justified only in the light of these conclusions. It is evident from these examples that even a homogeneous population closely bound by similar traditions is no guarantee for the successful functioning of democracy and may sooner or later yield to some other form of government if the people are divided into two aggressive and hostile groups on fundamental issues. Where however the population is not homogeneous and is settled in an area as vast as the whole of Europe excluding Russia democracy is out of the question for the unit as a whole unless it is first split up into homogeneous parts grouped into new national states to decide whether democracy or some other form of Government suits them.

Another main consideration which moves a true nationalist to support the right to self-determination of every human group closely bound by similar traditions is the desire that all groups should meet on terms of equality and friendship each preserving its own laws and institutions. The ideal of true nationalism implies close relationship between different nations on the basis of equality and not for the elimination of differences. It is the more civilised development of the very differences which divide one na-

tional group from another that will promote peace and progress of the world. If two nations are forced to observe alike customs and creeds and to be uniform in their likes and dislikes, both will become mutually aggressive and the stronger will try to suppress the weaker. The world will be a loser for being deprived of the political experience, culture and traditions of the suppressed nation. On the other hand if two nations live on terms of friendship, both will enrich the world by their varied experience and development of their respective laws and institutions. An intelligent friendship between two persons promotes rather than hinders the individuality of each. An attempt to force union between two human groups, other than on terms of equality, will be a step in the direction of Imperialism. We hate the word 'imperialism' for it implies oppression and exploitation of human groups by a dominant power within its empire.

"If nationalism can imply the close relationship even in the same state of many races, so Imperialism can imply the recognition within the same state of many different interests." In this respect there is no difference between the two ideals. This may be illustrated by two examples. The British Empire is said to be the true example of Imperialism. The British race is admittedly the dominant partner in the Empire. The ideal before the empire is free

and equal partnership for every nation within the British Commonwealth. The ideal implies the right of every nationality to responsible self Government. On the other hand China is said to be a truly national state which is fighting for her very existence against Japan. The Chinese are popularly known as a homogeneous people closely bound by common traditions. The goal before the Chinese is a national democratic state. But the Chinese nationalists have deprived the Muslim part of their State, known as Chinese Turkistan of their right to national independence. The people of Sinkiang have nothing in common with the rest of China in race religion language and culture and yet they are forced to accept union with China. The Chinese nationalists have further deprived many other non Chinese parts of their state of the right to independent existence. Mongolia, Tibet and Manchuria are strictly speaking not part of China. Judged by any modern standard the people of these lands have as good a right to self government as the people of China proper. It is therefore evident that Chinese nationalism in no way differs from British Imperialism. England has frankly assumed the role of an Imperial State, while China cloaks its intentions through the garb of nationalism.

None of these states neither England

nor China, present a sufficient parallel for the case of India. The Hindu nationalists of India may follow for the present the tactics of Chinese nationalists and may deceive the whole world into believing that like the Chinese they are keen to preserve the integrity and unity of their country, but they will be ultimately disillusioned and will have to recognise that true nationalism has a place both for Hindus and Muslims in their separate sovereign states.



## PART II

### LESSONS FROM ABROAD

#### 1 POLITICAL EXPERIENCE OF OTHER COUNTRIES

Political experience in the working of a parliamentary form of Government has so far been mostly confined to countries truly homogeneous in character. But even in their case a clear line of distinction has been drawn between countries having democratic traditions deep rooted in their history and those which have lacked such experience in the past. Great Britain France and U S A are the typical examples of countries which have been traditionally democratic, while most of the states created after the last European War and at least four among the Great Powers i.e. Germany Italy Russia and Japan can be conveniently grouped among countries which copied democratic institutions from others but were forced by peculiar circumstances in each case to adopt a dictatorship or at least to show a trend towards it as in case of Japan.

Political theorists of the modern age have based their conclusions upon states of the first order as they represent a natural growth. Al

most all other new states with the possible exception of Switzerland have borrowed their institutions from Great Britain or France or more recently from U S A States like the Austro-Hungarian, Turkish or Russian Empire before the last Great War had undoubtedly adopted parliamentary institution and were considered limited monarchies in constitutional language, but these were the illegitimate products of the new order and lacked the essentials for the successful establishment of democratic governments. Hence it was expected that at the earliest favourable opportunity the people of these states would either discard parliamentary governments or would regroup themselves in some new order to form coherent national states. Such an opportunity was furnished by the Great War of 1914-18. The post-war European settlement brought into existence eight new states on the collapse of these empires and gave a new meaning to the principle of self-determination which had so far been understood to mean the right of the ruling nation or majority to keep under permanent subjection the minorities in the name of unity, integrity and indivisibility of common motherland.

In Austria-Hungary, the Germans and the Magyars, the two dominant races, had united to preserve the limits of the 'Dual Monarchy' and could never entertain for a moment the right of their slave minorities to

separation. A sense of national unity had been created among the people by an appeal to their religious and political sentiments. The empire was the greatest Roman Catholic State in the world and the emperor the ruling head of the House of Hapsburg was the heir to the Holy Roman Empire and the representative of the oldest Christian Royal Family in Europe. The empire was faced with a common danger from the three neighbouring powers Germany, Italy and Russia, each of which had designs on a part of its territories. The minorities enjoyed local autonomy in their provincial units and were fully convinced that the break up of their empire would spell disunity for all. Their loyalty to their Emperor and their faith in the Pope, both of whom were equally interested in the preservation of their country were unquestioned nor again they doubted the historical role which their country had played in the past as the strongest bulwark of Christianity. They were adequately represented in the Parliaments at Vienna and Budapest and were conscious of the advantages that they enjoyed as citizens of a great Power. But all these considerations failed to appeal to them when the defeat of their country in the last war convinced them that their country could never be a match for a truly homogeneous state and that all efforts to weld them into a nation could never succeed. The peace makers of Europe were faced with a very

complex problem in settling the future of Austria-Hungary. They invented a new formula which would restore relations among the various minorities on a permanent basis. A minority concentrated in a compact area had the right to be converted into a majority by the readjustment of geographical frontiers. The Germans and Magyars were assigned separate territorial states. The Czechs, Slovaks, and Ruthenians were united to form the new state of Czecho-slovakia. Rumanian, Polish, Italian and Croat minorities were merged into their neighbouring states.

Who can doubt that the new political arrangements would not have remained permanent but for the ambitions of Germany and Soviet Russia? None of these countries were interested in the creation of the new states in Europe as they had incorporated territories which formerly belonged to them. Russia in particular resented that she should be blocked from access to sea by the creation of a chain of states on her western border. Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the greater part of Poland had been parcelled out of Russia. Germany at the same time was fretting at the loss of her Polish provinces. But the peacemakers of Europe could conceive of no other plan which could do justice to the people in the new states. Russia and Germany had no moral or legal right to rule over peoples

who had a distinct civilization of their own and who were entitled on the very basis on which the political conception of a modern state rests to form independent national states. Those who think that the people in the new states should have been left in their original countries as existed before the war overlook the fact that this would have been no guarantee for the stability of peace in Europe. Sooner or later an aggressive Germany or a Communist Russia was bound to rise into power and to encroach upon weaker neighbours. Hence the only security to the peace of Europe, nay to that of the world lies in the recognition of the right of every nation to independent existence and in the limitation of the desire of one nation to dominate the other.

If we concede it to be the right of Germany or any other nation to annex by force the territories that belong to others there can be no real peace in the world and the talk of all self Government will be meaningless. We should always have in view the moral and permanent basis of a political arrangement and not one extorted by force. The loss of independence by many a European nation at present is a temporary phase and cannot permanently delay the re establishment of national states or the reinforcement of the principle of self determination.

At the outset, I pointed out that a

parliamentary form of government is really meant for a truly homogeneous people and that our political generalisations are based upon its working in an ideal form. The terms state, nation, majority, minority, sovereignty, parliament, party in power, party in opposition, unity, integrity, indivisibility, democracy, nationality and numerous others are all true in a special sense. Their right conception presupposes a political society which satisfies certain essential conditions. It is not sufficient for our purpose that we should give the character of a national state to "a body of human beings deriving its corporate unity from the fact that its members acknowledge permanent obedience to the same government. If this conception is accepted, the Turkish, Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires before the last war were national States which in fact they were not. No political society can be considered to be in a stable and satisfactory condition if its members have no other bond to unite them except their obedience to the same government. A society solely organised to establish law and order among its members or to preserve itself against external aggression lacks the cohesive force which gives it real strength to face dangers of foreign wars or internal discontent. Hence it is necessary that it should be united by further bonds implied in the word Nation.

Among the bonds that chiefly contribute to the internal cohesion of a strongly united society the most important are (1) conception of a common religion belief in a common origin possession of a common language and literature pride in common historic traditions common outlook on life in social customs and common economic interests None of these bonds by itself alone is a sufficient unifying force unless it is closely linked with one or more of others In addition for the nation to be coherent, two other factors are essential Firstly it should occupy a well defined compact part of earth's surface and secondly the people should have the consciousness that they represent a distinct culture and civilisation which will lose its creative force if they are placed in a position of political subjection

Europe before the present war was divided into 26 sovereign states America accounted for 19 and the rest of the world had 12 more states. Out of a total of 57 states 50 were truly homogeneous allied by the factors that can possibly be conceived in an ideal form These countries were faced with no minority problem in the true sense and were consequently free from dangers that attended an incoherent state In America the problem of race conflict at first seemed to present a disruptive force

but it was gradually replaced by other more powerful factors. The Spaniards and Portuguese were the first to colonise South America and parts of North America, south of the U.S.A. They had a clear line of demarcation which gave them a free hand in their respective spheres of influence. It is due to this political arrangement that while Brazil is mainly Portuguese in blood and language, the other states with the exception of U.S.A. and Canada are mainly Spanish. The original inhabitants or Negroes from Africa have mixed in more or less proportion with these European masters but this has been mainly due to their adoption of the religion, language and culture of the latter. In U.S.A., the British stock still represents two-thirds of the population and the other European settlers have distinctly entered the new state to adopt its political and social institutions which have converted the whole of the American Republic into an English speaking people.

In Europe, the problem of religion was an important factor in the past in the formation of the new states. The Austro-Hungarian Empire had no real link to maintain unity among its various peoples except a common religious and so was the case in Russia, where the Christian subjects of the Czar looked to him at the Head of the



Greek Catholic Church The Spanish State only became national after the Muslim and Jewish elements in population had either been forcibly driven out or converted The Belgians refused to live under the Protestant Dutch as they were Roman Catholics while more recently the Protestant Ulster declared its separation from the Roman Catholic Irish The Southern Germans delayed for two centuries the process of unification of Germany as they could not agree to the hegemony of Prussia, which was a Protestant state, Great Britain too up to the 17th century pursued a hostile policy towards her Roman Catholic subjects and imposed serious disabilities upon all those who did not accept her established Church The religious question has now fallen in the back ground in every European state as the prevailing religion in every state corresponds with the religion of almost all its inhabitants The Europeans are all Christians and even where they differ in their main sectarian view they have been saved the clash of interests by this political divisions into states which represent their respective sects Thus England Holland Norway Sweden Denmark and Germany are Protestant while Spain Portugal France Belgium Italy Rumania Poland are Roman Catholic, Russia Greece Bulgaria owed their allegiance to the Greek Catholic Church

India with its present bounds and limits and its diversity of races, religions and languages is out of the conception of political theorists who have so far invented no terminology to express such a new state. It does not possess any of the unifying factors which have succeeded in welding people in other countries into nations. If the 360 millions of its inhabitants are considered as a collective whole there is no possible link which can be conceived to unite them except their political unity under a foreign government. No body has the least doubt that this link will lose all force once the British leave the country and its peoples are thrown on their own resources to devise a government suitable to their needs. Judged by any test, India cannot be ranked among coherent national states. It is indeed a misnomer to call the future Indian Government a national government and its Legislatures a national Parliament. The Irish Catholics never considered the British Parliament as national in character though the latter had guaranteed them an excessive representation of 'a 100 members in the House of commons. So again the Czechs in the new German Empire though a minority of 10 millions out of a population of a 100 millions or more will never agree to call a future parliament to be summoned by Hitler, a national organ of the state' For any institution to be truly

national it must claim the willing consent of all people, who are said to be represented by it. The Congress may be a national organisation for the Hindus and the Schemes outlined by it for the future government of India may be called national but the terms will be understood in a restricted sense or more truly from the Hindu point of view

Similarly the terms majorities and minorities may be true in case of a country homogeneous in character where the people are allied by ties of religion race language history and culture but they indicate nothing except confusion of thought when applied to a country where both are unchangeable and permanent. In Great Britain the Conservatives, Liberals or Labourites may each in turn come in power and form the ruling majority but they are all agreed on essential fundamental principles of life and so have nothing to fear from political rise for the time being of one party or another. The character of the Government always remains national so long as it represents the party system. But a country divided by conflicts of religion and two distinct civilisations cannot be said to have a national government nor will ever attain peace and progress unless political differences are finally settled. It may have a makeshift arrange

ment to meet emergencies or to unite against a common danger, Austria-Hungary before the last war presented such an example. The people seemed politically united under the House of Hapsburg, and they had accepted parliamentary institutions at the Centre and in Provinces but by no stretch of imagination the Government could be called strictly national,

When we say that a majority has the legal right to impose its decisions on a minority, we always have in mind the picture of a truly national state. Political experience of Europe and America knows of no minorities which are permanently at variance with their majorities and are prepared to carry their differences to the point of separation. The Civil War of America may be cited as an example in contradication of this point but on careful reflection it will be found that there the differences arose among the members of the same community, allied in religion, language, culture and tradition. The people of the Northern and Southern States had no other point of difference except the question of slavery. Such cases of conflict on rare occasions arise among homogeneous peoples when their governments have failed to enlist the sympathies of the vast majority of their people. The Civil War in England in the reign of Charles I, the recent Civil War in Spain, are clear illustrations of

this. But these examples only prove that a majority in a truly national state has the legal right to impose its will on the minority. In fact we cannot justify the governments that were established after the Civil Wars in England, America and Spain except on the ground that they were supported by the majority of the people in each case.

The question takes an entirely different form when we consider its decisions in a state lacking internal cohesion and opposed by an important element in its population. If such a case "the divine right of majorities" can never be accepted as a rational basis for political construction. The reason is obvious. The existing boundaries of a State may be a majority in a compact part of it. In fact those who hold that a government to be legitimate must rest on the consent of the governed are of the opinion that the right of the majority of members of a state to rule must be qualified by the right of a minority to secede and to form a new state, when it is in a majority in a contiguous portion of its old state's territory.

Henry Sidgwick "conceives that there are cases in which the true interests of the whole may be promoted by disruption. According to him if in the portions of the same country their respective inhabitants have divergent needs and demands in respect of legislation and other Government interference on account

of differences of race, religion past history or present social conditions, it is no longer desirable that they should have a common government for internal affairs, while if at the same time, their external relations apart from their union would be very different and there is danger that each part may lose more by the risk of implications in others' quarrels, than it is likely to gain from the aid of military force, complete separation is the only remedy. He says emphatically that "under such conditions as these, it is not to be desired that any sentiment of historical patriotism or any pride in the national ownership of an extensive territory, should permanently prevent a peaceful dissolution of the incoherent whole into its natural parts."

In the light of the above remarks, it becomes easy to understand the attitude of Muslim League on the present political situation of India. Hindus and Muslims are two separate nations concentrated in majorities in compact parts of India. Muslims form the majority of population in the five contiguous political units of the Punjab, Kashmir, N W F.P., Sind and Baluchistan and also in Bengal and Assam. Taken India as a whole, the 90 millions of Muslim are reduced to a minority, but in the two compact areas in the north-west and north-east, they are entitled to the rights of a sovereign nation. By their separation under two national states, the rest

of India becomes more truly homogeneous and the bulk of Hindu population is concentrated in a contiguous portion of territory. The League's Pakistan scheme secures to the Hindus more than  $2/3$  of India and almost  $3/4$  of its population. The Muslims in their two sovereign states do not have more than 80 millions of people or just less than their actual population in India. If the Hindus do not modify their political aspirations and are carried away by the empty slogans of India's unity, integrity and indivisibility, they will delay the independence of even that portion which is actually theirs and will be held responsible on the bar of world opinion for the permanent estrangement in the relations of the two communities.

## 2 VIVISECTION OF THE BRITISH ISLES

The British Isles originally comprised the whole of Ireland as well as the main island of Great Britain which is made up of England, Wales and Scotland. In size they occupy an area smaller than the Punjab or about 1/13th that of India. They are inhabited by a more or less homogeneous people allied by religion, race, language and culture. For more than 400 years, the British Isles remained united under a common political system and have developed a common system of law and common economic interests. But differences in past history prior to the Union of Ireland with Great Britain, and a sectarian outlook on life which has divided the Roman Catholic from the Protestant have resulted in the permanent estrangement of the Irish from the British nation. The British who are the majority people in the British Isles and account for more than 90 p.c. of its population have accepted in good faith the principle of self-determination for the Irish minority and have practically agreed to the vivisection of what was formerly called the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.



Today the Irish Free State which represents just less than 1/4th of total area of the British Isles is a separate independent Republic with complete sovereign right. It has full control over its foreign policy and defence as is evident from the fact that while Great Britain is engaged in the greatest war of the world for her very existence, the Irish Free State feels no moral or legal obligation to join the war on its side. It is apparent that the principle of *vivis* section has been applied in the most naked form in the British Isles and it has so far produced no conflict or active hostility between the two countries

The Irish Free State occupies a position of great strategical importance and can provide important naval and air bases for the protection of allied ships from submarine attacks. Its separation from Great Britain could never be justified on strategic and economic grounds. Ireland is mainly an agricultural country and its farm produce is indispensable for Great Britain especially in time of war when means of communication by sea are exposed to enemy attacks. It can be said to the credit of the British people that instead of having a discontented and unwilling partner in their Kingdom they have agreed to the partition of their island kingdom as a measure of appeasing the Irish minority.

The Indian nationalists who preach daily the gospel of India's eternal unity, integrity and indivisibility must learn a lesson from the British example. If the greatest ruling nation of the world can agree to the vivisection of its homeland which has remained politically and culturally united for centuries in the past under a common system of government, there is no reason why the majority community in India should not adopt a similar policy in its treatment of the great Muslim minority and concede once for all the Muslim demand for self-determination, which is adversely termed by the Hindus as the vivisection of India

India of the past which is idealised by the Hindus as the period of their ancient culture and civilisation, was neither a political nor a cultural entity. The conception of a united India is foreign to the Hindu mind. The epics of Mahabarta and Ramayana, the rise and decline of established Hindu dynasties under the Mauryas and the Guptas, and the revival of Hindu Kingdoms during the Rajput period in History all confirm the plain fact that India with its present bounds and limits was never governed as a united Hindu Empire.

Efforts were made under Asoka, and King Harsha to conquer the whole of India but they never met with complete success. The Hindus cannot boast of any ruling dynasty which extended its sway over the whole of the present-

day known India. The Guptas whose empire is looked upon as a real enterprise of the Hindus in the direction of union and consolidation never ruled over India beyond the Jumna and south of the Vindhya-chal Mountains. Their reign extended over the greater part of Northern India excluding the Punjab and other adjoining lands.

In view of this plain reading of History that vivisection was the order of the day in the ancient India of Hindu imagination one is simply surprised at the fancied importance which Hindu leaders attach to India's unity in the past. Muslims are prepared to concede that India remained politically united for the greater part under the Muslim Kings but then the unity so achieved was not the unity of a national state but that of an empire based upon conquest. When the British came to India even this idea of an empire had been shaken to its very foundation and there was a group of warring states, each ready to encroach upon its neighbour. The British undoubtedly have given to parts of India a sense of political unity but this is all an unnatural growth and a result of a mere accident. The essential factors for common political or cultural unity are as lacking in India today as they were in the past.

The Indian nationalists may continue to derive inspiration from the example of na

tional states in the West, but they should remember that nationalism is a double-edged sword and cut both ways. It unites such elements in a country as are already joined together by ties of a common culture, but it marks out for separation and actually hastens the process of disintegration in regard to such elements of the population as are diametrically opposed in their political aspirations.

Imagine a country inhabited by a homogeneous people, possessing the marks of a common nationality, being liberated from the yoke of one or two ruling nations. The natural result will be that freedom in such a case will immediately lead to unity. The case of Poland before the last Great War clearly illustrates this point. The ancient historical kingdom of the Poles had been split up into three parts, each under the rule of one of the biggest powers of continental Europe. The collapse of Czarist Russia, Austria-Hungary and Germany after the last War was immediately followed by a desire for union among the Polish subjects of these empires. Hence came into existence a strong and united Polish State, which unfortunately had to give way afterwards before the superior forces of Nazi Germany.

But quite the reverse is the case of a country, inhabited by heterogeneous elements, all demanding separation on their own terms.

Liberation from foreign yoke in case of such a country implies liberation for the important elements that compose the population. India presents a typical example in this respect. The Hindus and Muslims form predominant majorities in some well defined areas of this vast sub-continent. The bulk of the Muslim population in India is concentrated in two separate zones in the North West and North-East, each of which in view of its large population and abundant resources is capable of developing into a progressive national state which can favourably compare with some of the leading states of the world. Vivisection in case of India is merely the acknowledgement of the principle that India's present unity is a British creation and that it cannot be preserved except under an Imperialism of the worst type where one community will dominate over the other. The proper solution lies in following the example of the British Isles which have been vivisected to concede the demand of the Irish minority for self-determination.

### 3 SOVIET RUSSIA AND ITS MINORITIES.

#### [ 1 ]

Russia before the Revolution of 1917 was a vast empire whose 200 races and nationalities, differing widely in education, religion and economic development had been held together by a brutal policy of Russification. It comprised European Russia, Siberia, Turkistan and Transcaucasia. The Russians formed 68 per cent of the total population of the Empire while among the minorities, the Turko-Tartar races, the Ukrainians, Poles, Finns, White Russians, the Baltic peoples were the most important groups. There was seething discontent among the minority peoples for national independence but the dominant voice of the Russian majority left them no hope that they could ever claim separation.

Some of the minority peoples were concentrated in certain compact parts of the Empire, particularly those living on the western border, Trans-Caucasia and Central Asia. There were five separate races on the Western border which were eager for their independence. The Finns, Latvians, Lithuanians, and Poles occupied the most important maritime

provinces of the west, and though they predominated in numbers in their respective provinces, yet there was no geographical frontier in the strict sense which could separate them from the rest of Russia. In fact their country formed part of the vast Russian plain which sloped on the western border. All the important sea ports and commercial towns of the West lay on the Baltic Coast. Riga, Helsingfors and Reval were flourishing sea ports while Poland with its towns of Warsaw, Lodz, Vilna was the most advanced industrial centre of Russia. Baltic Sea was practically a Russian lake and provided the only direct sea route to Russia for its trade with the countries of Western Europe. The greater part of the Russian navy was kept on the Baltic Coast, which was further strongly fortified to guard against German naval attacks.

Thus geographically, commercially and strategically the Western provinces were the most important part of European Russia and their separation could be nothing less than a great blow to the power and prestige of Russia in Europe. But the minority races of the Western border had awakened to their political consciousness and the ties of a common religion, motherland and economic union could not hold them together as part of Russia. Undoubtedly they had to suffer nothing by their union in material prospects. The entire Russian foreign

trade passed through their towns and seaports they provided intellectual and commercial centres of the Empire, they shared in full its industrial and commercial prosperity. But they were ready to forego all these advantages to satisfy their political aspirations for full independence. Immediately, on the outbreak of the Revolution of 1917, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland declared their independence which was later on duly recognised by the new Soviet regime in Russia. This separation movement on the part of the 5 western states was a direct reply to the Russification policy of the Russian majority prior to 1917.

The latter aimed at unifying Russia as the home of Russians irrespective of racial and religious differences. They pursued the policy of the adoption of a single language for the whole of Russia and the 'liquidation of all national cultures'. In the first flush of Bolshevik assumption of power, the new masters of Russia declared that all national groups in Russia had a right to self-determination and to develop their own language and literature. Consequently obscure languages were revived and transcribed, alphabets were devised for dialects which formerly possessed no written literature, native languages were introduced in schools, courts and government institutions of various regions and an effort was made to select local officials from



native population. The Bolsheviki leaders thereby hoped to check the separation of the various nationalities but failed owing mainly to their own failure to implement their professed aims. Despite Government's efforts to equalise the economic and cultural opportunities of the national groups composing the Union the Russians who still form 68 per cent of the population continue to occupy a dominant position in the United Soviet Russian federation and enjoy marked preponderance in its administration.

One would perhaps not object to the natural advantages which the Russians still enjoy due to their preponderance in population but the Soviet regime has absolutely failed to live up to their professions particularly with regard to the Muslim nationalities in Central Asia and Trans-Caucasia who are still being forced to remain parts of United Russian federation. After the revolution of 1917 all the majority peoples had begun to clamour for independence. White Russia, Ukraine, the peoples of Caucasasia and Central Asia had sought to erect national states with foreign assistance. In Transcaucasias three independent republics were set up—Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. In the last named Muslims are a solid majority of 70%. But the Bolsheviki in their hour of glory forgot their promises and suppressed the new republics. The peoples were forced to accept

Soviet Government against their wishes. Each state on paper was given full internal autonomy with the right to develop its own culture and language, and to have its own supreme council and supreme court for administrative and judicial matters. Later on the 3 states were formed into Soviet Federated Socialist Republic of Trans-Caucasia

In Central Asia, the Turko-Tartar races form 95% of the total population and deserve full independence like the nationalities of the Western border. They live in a compact part of land which is a distinct geographical region, in its climatic and physical conditions. All the inhabitants are allied in race religion and culture and speak the same language. Pan-Turanism, the new movement encouraged by young Turks has taken a firm hold in the minds of people. After the defeat of Turkey in the Great War, some of its most prominent leaders had taken shelter in Central Asia. Enwar Pasha, of revered memory in particular was preaching the gospel of a united Turkish Empire and was planning to regenerate a new Turkey in the East far more war-like and invincible than the old Turkey. But the Bolsheviks foiled him in his efforts, defeated his armies and put an end to his ambitions. Thereafter the country was overrun by Red armies, the Amirs of Bokhara and Khiva were turned

out, and a Soviet administration was set up. The country was in course of time split up into 5 separate Soviet republics each representing its own typical race. The Kirghez, Tajiks, Uzbeks, Turkomans, Kazaks were all grouped under separate states.

In 1936 a new constitution was adopted for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which is known widely as the Stalin Constitution.

According to this Constitution the U S S R consists of 11 republics.

	Name	Area in sq miles	Popula- tion in Millions
1	Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic	6 367 768	105.6
2	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	170 998	31.9
3	White Russian Socialist Republic	49 022	5.4
4	Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic	32,959	2.9
5	Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic	26,865	3.1
6	Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic	11,580	1.1
7	Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic	171,384	1.2
8	Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic	66 392	5

Name		Area in sq miles	Popula- tion in millions.
9.	Tajikistan Soviet Socialist Republic	55,040	13
10	Kazak Soviet Socialist Republic	1,047,791	68
11	Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic	75,926	1.3
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		8,095,738	165.9

It will appear from the above that the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic possesses 90 per cent of the entire Soviet territory and 68 per cent of its total population. Allied with the R S F, S R are ten other constituent republics of which Ukraine, White Russia, Armenia and Georgia are really Christian republics and Azerbaijan, and the 5 republics of Central Asia are Muslim republics.

In addition to the ten constituent republics, there are 13 autonomous republics and 11 autonomous areas inside Russia proper where the non-Russian minorities have been granted full local autonomy and look after their own education, health, culture and language. The policy of the Bolsheviks has been to create a separate autonomous area for every racial or religious group however small its numbers may

be provided it occupies a compact piece of land. Thus the colony of Germans on the Volga has been constituted into a German Volga Republic. Similarly for Muslim minorities the autonomous republics of Tartar Bashkir Dagestan Crimea Kara Kalpak, Kalmuk have been created inside Russia Proper. To safeguard further the interests of minorities a Council of Nationalities has been created at the Centre which enjoys equal powers with respect to legislation along with the Supreme Council which is elected by the direct vote of the peasants and workers. *To assimilate and bind together all minorities* intensification of class struggle has been the key note of Bolshevik policy. Emphasis is laid on the common interests of workers and peasants irrespective of their religion and nationality.

But despite all these benefits which the Soviet Government is supposed to have conferred upon minorities it has failed to inspire confidence in them and to win them over finally. In particular the people of Turkestan Trans-Caucasia and Ukraine who at present constitute ten union republics of equal status with Russia proper are really discontented as they command very little influence in the central administration of the Soviet. Even the Council of Nationalities at the centre has failed to give satisfaction to minorities as all power has concentrated in the hands of a dictatorial govern

ment which has suppressed all freedom of conscience, of opinion, of the press and of the meeting. It is quite possible that if the Soviet Government is engaged in a long war with Japan or Germany the minority peoples will seek an opportunity to rise in arms and to declare their independence. The discontent of the minorities is one of the main reasons why Bolshevik influence has not penetrated appreciably in the block of Islamic countries that lie to its south. The Muslims of Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq and Turkey realise very well that the Soviet has failed to do justice to the people of Turkistan and Trans-Caucasia and has suppressed the separate States which they had set up after the Revolution of 1917. The mere fact that the Bolsheviks have split up Turkistan into 5 separate republics instead of constituting the whole country into one Federated republic exposes their sinister motives of suppressing the growth of nationalism in Central Asia.

## [ II ]

The Left wing in the Indian Congress always looks to Soviet for inspiration, and eulogises its administration in high terms but it has failed so far to see the implications that are involved in the establishment of a peasants and workers' government in India on the Soviet model. The main difficulties in case of India are (1) Minority question, (2) Religion, (3)

Overcrowding of India as compared with the available area for habitation, (4) Conservatism of the Indian peoples (5) Capitalist tendencies of the upper and middle classes (6) Industrial backwardness. The minority question of India is far more complex than that of Russia which despite the liberal views of the Soviet leaders and the generous treatment of minorities has failed to inspire confidence among the latter. In Russia the Jews formed the vanguard of the revolutionary party and Lenin and many other leaders were drawn from them. In consequence the constitution was so devised as to provide equal economic and political rights for minorities and to suppress all chance of Russian domination and the policy of Russification. Sole emphasis was laid on the class struggle in which the workers and peasants of all nationalities were to form a common front against the aristocrats and bourgeoisie. But the preponderance of Russia proper in federal administration has practically overshadowed the ten constituent republics of the Union who are drifting towards nationalism. If India were to be divided on lines of Russia to satisfy the minority peoples the country would have to be split up into a large number of constituent Republics autonomous republics and areas. The sole policy in this new redistribution will be to establish national groups in different parts of the country on religious racial or cultural basis.





assigned autonomous areas or republics.

The Bolsheviks have created a separate autonomous area for every racial group how ever small its numbers may be provided it occupies a compact piece of land. Thus the colony of Germans on the Volga has been constituted into German Volga Republic. On similar lines minority question can be dealt within India. But when the entire scheme has been considered on Russian lines the question arises will it satisfy the Muslim minorities which number in India over 90 millions? In Russia there are both Christian and Muslim minorities numbering 40 and 30 millions respectively and the majority of these people live in compact parts where at the first opportunity they will form into independent states. The peoples of Ukraine White Russia Georgia Armenia Azerbaijan and the 5 republics of Central Asia can never be said to be permanently satisfied with their Union with Soviet Russia. Will not the same tendency exist in India especially when the Muslim minorities have such a large preponderance in the north west and north east of India and are linked together by ties of religion culture traditions common social customs and economic interests? Further the Muslims will be constantly reminded of the existence of independent Muslim States in other parts of the world and will look to them for an opportunity

to claim full national independence. Hence the only safe course which can satisfy the legitimate interests of the Muslims in India is to recognise their full rights of national independence in those compact parts where they are a majority and can combine to form separate states. As such, the 5 countries of the north-west, Punjab, Kashmir, Frontier Province, Sindh and Baluchistan can be recognised as a separate federated state, and the former province of Eastern Bengal and Assam can be recognised another Muslim area. In these two regions, Muslims will number more than 70% separately and also more than 70% of their total population in India. Roughly the population of these Muslim states will be 80 millions of which Muslims will form a majority of 60 millions. As against this the population of Hindu India will be 270 millions of which Muslims will form a minority of 25 millions.

The second difficulty in enforcing Soviet system of Government in India is religion. Both the Hindus and Muslims, the two major communities, are strictly speaking religious-minded people. An entirely materialistic conception of life will never be engrained in their minds. Real happiness according to the Muslim ideas is not to be attained by a blind pursuit of worldly objects, it lies in the possession of a contented mind which believes in 'virtue' and piety.

The Hindu ideal is also best represented by Mr Krishnamurti who in a recent article in the press condemn the tendencies of totalitarian states to suppress organised religion. He concluded the article with the remarks that the Indian race is essentially religious and attempts to plant irreligious doctrines in its moral and intellectual soil will meet with no permanent success.

The third difficulty is Overcrowding of India. The success of the Soviet system of Government is primarily due to the physical fact that Soviet Russia has unlimited resources in land forests, and mines. The total area of the Soviet Union is 80 lac square miles 5 times the size of India while the total population is less than half of India. Of this vast area forest land occupies 44% pasture, 11%, arable land 11% non agricultural land 31%. Of the arable land about 6% is actually under cultivation while a large part of forest land will be slowly brought under cultivation as soon as forests are cleared up. It is thus evident that Russia can meet the needs of her growing population and settle them on new lands which are at present covered with forests or pastures. India on the other hand has reached the limit of congestion in certain parts i.e. Bengal Bihar and U.P., and even if all land is equally apportioned among the peasants and farm labourers it will not yield them enough to subsist. It was quite easy for the Bolsheviks

to transfer population from one crowded part to another as they possess enough lands in reserve where they can settle millions of peasants in no time. Hence it is difficult to satisfy the land hunger of the Indian peasantry even by the appropriation of the large estates of landlords.

4 Conservatism of the Indian masses is another great setback. Social customs have taken such a firm root in the minds of the people that nothing less than a revolution can change their mentality. Despite the rapid assimilation of western influences the Hindu society is still caste-ridden and preserves all its ancient traditions in tact. The Brahmin is still not prepared to recognise equal rights of partnership with a Harijan in the material and social comforts and privileges that he enjoys. The depressed classes are still very backward, and the orthodox Hindu is not prepared to give them equal status in society. The Muslim too, is not prepared to change his outlook on life. He believes the good of humanity to lie in the observance of those laws and principles which his religion has fixed for him. A form of government where religion is given no place, marriage is held to ridicule, and family life is deprived of its harmony will not appeal to him. In Russia, the people were no doubt conservative minded prior to the Revolution, but then they had to face no caste-system or

untouchability in the form that India finds The Bolsheviks were essentially Christians who believed in the brotherhood and equality of man. Religious orders and the aristocrats had dominated and oppressed them so long that they had been reduced to abject poverty. Consequently an economic appeal in their own interest stirred up their feelings. But here in India the upper classes and priests do not appear so glaringly oppressive as to excite envy and hatred of the masses. Again whereas in Russia the common people attributed all their miseries to the clergy and the nobles who had usurped all their rights and were the mainstay of the oppressive rule of the Czars, no such feeling has arisen in India in regard to the clergy and the nobles. In fact the clergy in India are all poor while the nobles are not a privileged class here. The old nobility has entirely disappeared with the advent of British rule and new classes and persons have risen to positions of prosperity and plenty by their sheer ability and efforts.

5 The capitalist tendencies of upper and middle classes are also a great hinderance. In a Soviet regime there is no place for the private trader, the money lender and the propertied classes, which at present dominate life in Indian cities. The most influential element of the Indian Congress is drawn from cities and these at present have a deter

mining voice in the policy of the Congress. The intelligentsia and middle classes in India have become so much enamoured of the Western democratic system of Government that they think it nothing less than suicidal to the interests of the country to change the existing order. In any change of order in India, however, the Hindu trader and middle classes will suffer most. The peasants will repudiate all debts which they owe to money lenders and dispossess their landlords and the princes of their estates and possessions while in the cities, the monopoly of trade which is held by the Hindu middle classes will be abolished. The Muslim has comparatively little to lose materially as he does not possess his full share in the wealth of the country. In fact, if religion were not to create any difficulty in the way of his acceptance of Soviet principles, he would be the first to become their most ardent preacher.

6 Lastly the industrial backwardness of India cannot create a class of factory workers who constitute in Russia the ruling nation. India is mainly an agricultural country and the industrial population is comparatively small. This is mainly due to the paucity of minerals in India and the slow development of industries. Russia too was primarily an agricultural country, but its mineral wealth is unlimited and can support a

very large number of workers. Coal and iron the two essentials of modern industry do not exist together in large quantities while the output of the Indian mines is neither sufficient nor of very good quality. In cities the people are mainly engaged in trade, indigenous crafts and professions. There are very few factories on the model of those in Russia. Hence there is no ready supply of factory workers who in Russia formed the vanguard of revolution.

Some of the outstanding results of the Soviet regime are given below to give a further idea as to whether it is possible for India to follow Soviet Russia.

(1) Soviet regime has abolished class distinctions based upon wealth but it has failed to prevent differences based upon control of wealth.

(2) It has suppressed organised religion which is regarded as the cause of ignorance and superstition but this has been accompanied by a materialistic conception of life and a mystic exaltation of socialism and its prophet Lenin who is actually worshipped like a saint.

(3) State control over industry, trade, transportation, banking and agriculture has been established but this has implied concentration of power in the hands of a dictatorial government which has suppressed all freedom.

of conscience, of opinion, of the press and of meeting.

(4) It has grouped minorities in ten constituent republics and a large number of autonomous areas where they can develop their own culture and languages, encourage their own national characteristics and administer health, justice and other industrial activities, but despite all these benefits which it has conferred on minorities, it has failed to win them over finally.



very large number of workers. Coal and iron the two essentials of modern industry do not exist together in large quantities while the output of the Indian mines is neither sufficient nor of very good quality. In cities, the people are mainly engaged in trade indigenous crafts and professions. There are very few factories on the model of those in Russia. Hence there is no ready supply of factory workers who in Russia formed the vanguard of revolution.

Some of the outstanding results of the Soviet regime are given below to give a further idea as to whether it is possible for India to follow Soviet Russia.

(1) Soviet regime has abolished class distinctions based upon wealth but it has failed to prevent differences based upon control of wealth.

(2) It has suppressed organised religion which is regarded as the cause of ignorance and superstition but this has been accompanied by a materialistic conception of life and a mystic exaltation of socialism and its prophet, Lenin who is actually worshipped like a saint.

(3) State control over industry trade transportation banking and agriculture has been established but this has implied concentration of power in the hands of a dictatorial government which has suppressed all freedom.

of conscience, of opinion, of the press and of meeting

(4) It has grouped minorities in ten constituent republics and a large number of autonomous areas where they can develop their own culture and languages, encourage their own national characteristics and administer health, justice and other industrial activities, but despite all these benefits which it has conferred on minorities, it has failed to win them over finally.

## 4. LESSONS FROM BRITISH DOMINIONS

### I CANADA

The British Commonwealth of Nations comprises six Dominions Australia, Canada South Africa, New Zealand Newfoundland and the Irish Free State As defined by the Imperial Conference of 1926 the Dominions are autonomous communities within the British Empire equal in status in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or foreign affairs though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations

This definition was legally accepted in a special Act of the British Parliament on December 11 1931 known as the Statute of Westminster This Statute simply defines the relations of the Dominions with the Imperial Government and does not point out the differences in the working of their constitutions

Three of the Dominions have federal constitutions of more or less ideal form while the remaining three are unitary New Zealand Newfoundland and the Irish Free State have

each a single Parliament exercising full control over the whole territory. The Union of South Africa is apparently federal in form and comprises the self-governing colonies of the Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Transval, and the Orange Free State, but the Union Parliament has supreme power. Canada and Australia have true federal constitutions where power is shared between the federal and local governments and legislatures on definite principles which can only be altered under a strictly defined constitutional process.

A careful study of the constitution history of the Dominions will show that they have developed slowly into their present form and that in each case the constitution has been the result of circumstances and conditions peculiar to it. In Canada the recent trend has been towards a strong Federal Government, as the French minority feared that a loose federation of Provinces might tempt the U.S.A. to annex the whole of Canada and thus their present position would be reduced to a hopeless minority in the midst of an overwhelming English-speaking population. Australia, on the other hand had no such fear of aggression from a neighbour and hence the commonwealth constitution is based not on the desire as far as possible to unity, but rather on the granting to the States the retention of the maximum of authority compatible with the creation of unity in any sense.

Newfoundland lies in the immediate vicinity of Canada and cannot defend herself without the protection guaranteed to her as a member of the British commonwealth of Nations. Economically her interests are closely allied with Canada while in race religion and history the people do not differ from the English-speaking people of Canada

The people of Newfoundland however are not prepared to merge their identity into a greater Canada and to lose their separate independence. This is because they feel that separation secures to them far greater advantages than a scheme of union with Canada. The case of Newfoundland clearly proves that a community however small it may be cannot be forced against its will to lose her independent existence if it can feel secure in the enjoyment of its rights in a compact part which it occupies.

New Zealand is another self-governing Dominion which cannot defend her independence alone if she is deprived of the protection of the Imperial Navy and yet she is not prepared to enter into a common federation with Australia which may result in subordinating her position to the latter. Even the common danger of the rising power of Japan has failed to induce the two Dominions to unite into a single federal State. Undoubtedly the people living in both the

Dominions are linked by ties of blood, religion, language and history, but the mere fact that each Dominion wants to be secure in the development of its own economic resources has led them to form separate political orders.

I will now take up the remaining 4 Dominions and discuss how far the analogy of each can apply to India. I start with Canada first as its constitution has often been quoted as a model for India and a parallel of Hindu-Muslim problem has been sought in the racial question between English and French Canadians.

Canada has a population of  $10\frac{1}{2}$  millions, of which the French number 3 millions and the British are just over half of the total. The French form a prominent majority in the Province of Quebec and are also fairly represented in Ontario. The racial problem had assumed a serious turn in Canada prior to the North America Act of 1867. "The old Canada was French in blood and Roman Catholic in creed, the new was English and Protestant"

Pitt, the British Premier, made a serious attempt to grapple with the problem. The British Parliament passed in 1791 the Canada Constitutional Act which divided Canada into two Provinces. Upper (Ontario) and Lower (Quebec), and in each there were to be two Legislatures. The Executive was not to be

responsible to the Legislature. The system worked well for a time but there were inherent defects in it. The main drawback was that there was continuous friction between Legislature and Executive

Lord Durham was sent to devise a new constitution. According to his recommendations the Union Act of 1840 united once more the French and the British Canadas. The whole colony was new to have one Legislature with a responsible Executive. The Act, however only solved one difficulty that of friction between Executive and Legislature but it entirely failed to unite the Canadians into one nation

Provincial feeling was very strong and there was no real desire for unity. There was every danger that the Colony might be annexed by the neighbouring country the USA which was growing very formidable in power. British statesmen felt that a unitary form of government was unsuitable and that some form of federation was to be devised if Canada was not to disintegrate into fragments. They set to work to create a real stimulus for union. The French were told that their special interests would best be secured in a federal government which would allow the State of Quebec full autonomous powers. They were promised special rights of representation in the two federal houses

The Federal Act of 1867 assigned 24 senators each to Quebec and Ontario. In the House of Commons the number of members for Quebec was permanently fixed at 65, while the remaining provinces were assigned members according to population. The franchise was made universal by removing the property qualification. The French were allowed to have their own special schools and to retain the French system of law in Quebec. French was also to be recognised as an official language along with English. The French ecclesiastical system was also retained and was assured of State help.

Despite all these concessions under a federal constitution, the French would not have accepted the union if circumstances had not forced them to give up their idea of separation.

There were three clear motives which guided the average French-man to support the movement towards Canadian Federation. The first was that the neighbouring country, the U. S. A., was rapidly growing in power and the French Canadians were helpless to maintain their independent State in Quebec against it. They feared that if they did not join hands with the British Canadians, the latter might be induced to join the American Federation where their own kith and kin, the English-speakers,



people held a preponderance in population and thus they would no longer be able to preserve their religion language and race

The second motive which pressed the French Canadians for Union was that their own country was limited in area and resources, while in the remaining part of Canada there was unlimited scope for development of resources and expansion of population. The Western Central Provinces were yet thinly peopled and were rich in forests and mines. So the desire to share in the exploitation of the undeveloped parts of Canada was a great factor in moving them towards Union.

Thirdly the British Government was pursuing a policy of appeasement towards the French. Under its influence the British Canadians were willing to offer them liberal concessions and to fraternise with them on equal terms. The British Government and loyal Canadians genuinely felt that unless the French Canadians were pacified Federal unity could not be achieved and that with a house divided against itself the chances of interference or possible annexation by the U S A would increase. This changed attitude of the British Government and British Canadians had also a soothing effect upon the French.

There were other influences too at work. The British Empire had grown so as to cover

one-fourth area of the whole world with one-fourth of the world population. Its resources were inexhaustible. The French Canadians could naturally be not the losers by participating in the advantages likely to be obtained. France, after the middle of the 19th century, had on the other hand, begun to decline in prestige and power and had been practically overshadowed in European politics by Germany which had inflicted a crushing defeat on the Republic in 1871. Hence the French Canadians could no longer look to their mother-country for protection and inspiration. Their sympathies were now 'equally divided' between the British and French Governments as both had been drawn into a close alliance in face of the rising danger in Central Europe.

The close comradeship in arms of the British and French nations in two of the greatest wars in History, the Great war of 1914 and the present War have exercised a further unifying influence upon the minds of the French and English Canadians.

In addition to the reasons outlined above, there were other factors which have influenced the French Canadians to unite under a Federal Government. These are in the words of Mr. Abdullah Yusuf Ali, compactness, organisation self-reliance and education. "The French are concentrated in two Provinces, Quebec and Ontario. They are well-organised both in

Church and State. They suffer from no inferiority complex on the score of being a minority as they have no chances of friction with the British Government or the British Canadians. They have an efficient system of education both secular and religious worked out by themselves without internal quarrel and friction "

It is apparent that the analogy of Canada does not apply to India. The movement for separation in Canada was checked by circumstances which have no counter-part in India. The French Canadians, felt that separation would not bring them such material advantages as Federation. They feared the annexation of Canada by the U S A which might have reduced their position to an insignificant minority in the midst of a hostile English speaking population. They wanted to take a due share in the exploitation of the resource\* of vast areas which were still undeveloped. They were assured of special rights in preservation of their own system of law and education excessive representation and other economical privileges. They were to participate in the common advantages of an Empire which has in exhaustible resources. They had no historical cause of friction left with the British Government as their mother country had drawn into closer alliance with it. Lastly the French Canadians were sufficiently strong and organised, both educationally and economically to hold their own.

None of their conditions holds good in case of Indian Muslims. Their desire for separation is determined by the carefully weighed consideration that separation will bring them more good than federation

There is no real danger, as existed in the case of Canada in the rising power of the U S A., that in case of division into Hindu India and Muslim areas India will be annexed by a foreign country. Muslim North West can easily enter into a non-aggression pact with the neighbouring Muslim States and safeguard her independence.

Again, there are no economical advantages which Muslims can gain by accepting a Federal Government. The Muslim areas are sparsely populated in some parts and there is abundant scope for their development and the expansion of population. If they are merged into a united India, they will be flooded in no time with immigrants from Hindu India which has reached the stage of congestion in many parts. In Canada, on the other hand, it was the very desire of sharing in the exploitation of the undeveloped parts which determined their choice to accept Federation

The French in Canada had to reckon with a people who, though differing in race and sect, yet were not exclusive and caste-ridden in their outlook on life. Inter-dining and intermarrying were not a total prohibition in

their conception of a common European civilisation

In India the Muslims are face to face with a people whose very social system is the negation of democracy. The problems of caste untouchability, restricted meals, prohibition of meat, undue reverence of cow, music before mosque etc., are peculiar to India.

The Muslims cannot repose their faith in the good will of a people who have reduced a quarter of their own number to the position of untouchables who are not allowed to draw water from a common well or to worship in a common temple.

In the economic field there is an open conflict between a Muslim and a Hindu. In urban areas the Muslim middle classes have been ousted from all share in carrying trade particularly in cloth and grain which have become a close monopoly of the Hindus. In rural areas the Muslim agriculturists are groaning under a heavy load of debt which they owe to the Hindu moneylender and their only hope lies in the repudiation of those debts. Banking, insurance and many other business activities have become an exclusive concern of Hindus.

In Canada the British Government recognised the necessity of appeasing the French Canadians fearing that their discontent would provide a chance for interference to the U.S.A.

which would not like to have a discontented neighbour. The British Canadians, who were loyal to their motherland were also alive to this danger and were prepared to make all possible concessions to the French,

In India, on the other hand, the Hindus do not admit the necessity of appeasing Muslims to make them willing partners of Federation. They have no fear that any neighbouring Muslim State can effectively intervene to help the Muslims or can embark upon a scheme of annexing the country. Consequently, they are bent upon depriving them of the special concessions that they hold at present in the form of communal electorates or special representation in services,

The Congress wants a strong federal government at the centre without convincing the Muslims that it will be to their own interest. The French Canadians accepted a strong Central Government for fear that the disintegration of Canada might provide America an opportunity to annex it. Does a similar fear exercise the minds of Muslims? In their case, it is the fear that the enforced union of the Centre will be fraught with grave consequence for them that stimulates their desire for separation.

Again, in case of Canada, the French and British Canadians had fraternised as a result of

the development of friendly relations and comradeship in arms between the French and the English nations. Here in India the Muslims can never expect that a strong and powerful government under the influence of an aggressive Hindu majority newly inspired with the cult of nationalism can ever be fair in its dealings with the neighbouring Muslim countries. Rather it is feared that the future India is bound to come into conflict with Afghanistan on the question of territorial adjustment of the Frontier. If the Muslims are content to accept the status of a minority the Indian Government of the future will also be interested in keeping Muslims in Central Asia and Chinese Turkistan as permanent minorities under the Russian and Chinese Governments and will enter into an imperial alliance with these powers lest the Muslim minorities in any of these countries should assert their claims for independence.

## II SOUTH AFRICA

Next to Canada the racial question has been grappled with by British statesmen in South Africa. The Dutch were virtually masters of the Cape Colony prior to its final annexation by the British. On the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1792, the Colony was occupied by a British force at the request of the Netherlands Government as the mother country had been conquered by the French Republic. In

1802 when the Treaty of Amiens was signed, the Colony was returned to the Dutch. Subsequently, on the renewal of war with Napoleon, Cape was reoccupied in 1806 by the British and was finally purchased in 1814 at the conclusion of the war from the Dutch Government.

Under the British, the Colony began to attract large numbers of immigrants from the British Isles. Conflicts were bound to arise between the Dutch farmers and the English rulers. The Dutch retired more and more into the interior and finally began their mass movement for the evacuation of the Cape Colony and the establishment of new homes in the Orange Free State and the Transvaal republic. The Dutch established very strong states which were steadily encroaching upon the territories of native chiefs, finally they were involved in war with the British Government which led to the annexation of their colonies in 1902.

The British parliament passed the Union Act in 1919 under which the four colonies of the Cape Colony, Natal, the Orange Free State and the Transvaal, were united in a legislative Union under one government in the name of the Union of South Africa. The Act provided for a Governor-General, an Executive council in charge of Departments of State, a Senate and a House of Assembly. The Colonies accepted the position of Provinces, and the Govern-



ment became unitary in form. In each Province an Administrator was appointed by the Governor-General in Council for five years and a Provincial Council elected for the same period having an executive committee of four to be presided by the Administrator. The Provincial Councils and Committees have authority to deal with local matters such as provincial finance primary education local bodies roads and bridges charity and hospitals markets fish and game, but all ordinances passed by them are subject to the veto of the Governor-General in Council.

The question may arise here why have the Dutch agreed to accept a strong Central Government which has reduced the four colonies to the status of mere Provincial Divisions? Firstly the brief historical review given above will convince the reader that the Dutch settlers of South Africa were forced to accept the British administration as a result of a series of conflicts and frictions culminating in the Boer War of 1899. Had the British armies not forcibly occupied the Dutch States of Transvaal and Orange Free State the latter would have developed into independent states. The Dutch settlers were so anxious to preserve their full political and economic independence that after annexation of the Cape Colony by the British Government they left their homes en masse in order to establish new colonies farther in

land. But they had to give way before the superior British power

Secondly, the acceptance of a strong Central Government in no way adversely affects Dutch interests. Numerically, they exceed the British element in two Provinces and are just equal in two others. Out of a total European population of 16 76 lacs according to the census of 1936, those who follow the Dutch Church number 9 21 lacs, or over 55 per cent. The Dutch majority in population is clearly reflected in the Senate and the House of Assembly, as the franchise has been extended to all males or females above the age of 21 and the property and wage qualifications have been removed.

Thirdly, the Dutch have accepted a unitary form of government, as this enables them, apart from making their influence felt at the Centre, to have further chances of sharing in the exploitation of native lands along with the English.

The natives form a majority of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  millions out of a total population of  $9\frac{1}{2}$  according to the census of 1936. All sorts of restrictions have been imposed upon them to check their expansion towards lands specially reserved for Europeans. They have no governing voice in the affairs of the Dominion nor can they ever aspire to the status of a constitutional majority. The Union is considered to be the homeland of people of European extraction and is expected

in course of time to have a preponderance of European population. The Representation of natives Act, 1936, provides for the direct representation of natives in the Senate and the establishment of a Native Representation Council. But this in practice means that out of 40 members on the Senate only four will be natives while the Native Representation Council with its 6 official and 12 native elected members is a mere advisory body whose function is to consider and report upon legislation concerning natives.

Fourthly the Dutch accepted Union as in this way alone they could control the immigration problem through their powerful influence at the Centre. Both the Dutch and the English settlers were alive to the danger of the new rising powers in Central Europe which were fast expanding in population and were in search of new homelands to settle their surplus population. Germany in particular by her close contact with the Union Territory through the prewar German Colony of South West Africa had designs on British South Africa and considered it a possible homeland for the future expansion of the German population. The Dutch sought in the union an effective voice to safeguard against this new danger and joined hands with the British in closing the doors to German or Italian settlers in any large numbers.

Many other considerations have weighed with the Dutch in their agreeing to live as common citizens along with the British. The Dutch knew that the British power was supreme in the greater part of Africa that it possessed the strongest navy to protect the Union from its enemies, that there were many undeveloped areas in the north of the Union which were rich in soil and mines and offered chances for exploitation. By throwing in their lot with the British, they could ensure their own security against danger and better their economical prospects.

The Boers also realised that though strong and organised, they were still a minority in the midst of an overwhelming native population and they could not form a stable government by their own efforts without the active assistance of the British element in the population. They could no longer look to their mother-country for support which was helpless to interfere in their war of 1899. Moreover, the consoling idea that their fellow-brothers in the mother-country still had ample opportunities for progress and expansion in the possession of the Dutch East Indies made them reconciled to their lot, and changed for the better their attitude towards the British.

When it is added to this that the British Government, after the enforcement of the Act

of Union has always followed a policy of appeasement towards the Dutch and conceded the latter the right to maintain their Church and Law it is possible to understand why the Dutch have become attached to the Union Government.

From the above it follows that the Union Government cannot be quoted as furnishing any parallel to solve Hindu Muslim problem in India. A unitary Government is out of the question in India. The Dutch accepted it as it gave them an effective voice at the Centre while the British Africans sought their protection in the future increase in British immigrants and the patronage of the British Parliament. The Hindus undoubtedly will have an effective voice at the Centre if a strong government responsible to the Legislature is established but where is the protective hand which can dispel all fears from the mind of a Muslim against possible encroachment by the Hindu majority. In the Union the Dutch are a majority of the European population while the British minority has nothing to fear as it is protected by the strong hand of Great Britain.

The Indian Muslims are a minority of 25 per cent and cannot rely upon the good will of the majority community which socially economically and politically is poles asunder from it. The very protection of

the British Government on which they could rely is considered inconsistent with the ideas of nationalism, unity and democracy

The Muslims in India have to gain nothing by accepting the idea of a common nation which will be predominantly Hindu in outlook. The best way for them to preserve their religion, language and culture as well as their political and economic interests is to assume sovereign power in predominantly Muslim parts of India. Desire for Federation is absolutely lacking on the part of Muslims and if they are forced to unite, the consequences will be a constant state of civil war. The strong hand of British Imperialism may preserve the political unity of India for some time, but there is no guarantee that circumstances will remain unchanged for ever.

A community of 90 millions conscious of its historic role and sharing in common with the rest of the Muslim World the noblest and best aspirations of life, cannot be forced to live in a permanent state of subjection. Independence has no meaning for it, if it results in leaving it at the mercy of the very community which in the last 200 years has been its greatest rival in every sphere of public activity. There are, in addition, deep-rooted historical differences which can only be obliterated by a fair recognition of the full part which each

community has to play in the promotion of its own interests

### III AUSTRALIA

The commonwealth of Australia was constituted under an Act passed by the British Parliament in 1900. The Act proclaimed that the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland and Tasmania had agreed to be united in a Federal Commonwealth and made provision for the inclusion of Western Australia in the Commonwealth if its people so desired. A close study of the events culminating in the establishment of the Commonwealth of Australia will clearly signify that the federal constitution was demanded by the people of all the independent colonies in their own common interests. The British Parliament simply recognised the desire to unite on the part of the colonial peoples, and gave it a material form through the Act of 1900. If there had been no agreement among the colonies desirous of the union, the Commonwealth would not have been formed and might have been delayed indefinitely. The very fact that Western Australia refused to form the Commonwealth as it considered its union with other colonies detrimental to its economic interests shows that every State was free to choose its own future.

New South Wales was the earliest colony to have its own independent government. The name at first was given to the entire eastern part of Australia on its discovery by Captain Cook in 1788. In 1851 its southern part was separated from it and formed into a new colony under the name Victoria. In 1859, the northern part of the colony was also separated to form the new colony of Queensland. All these three colonies were granted responsible government after 1855.

Southern Australia was at first a convict settlement, but was proclaimed into a province in 1836 and was granted responsible government in 1856. Western Australia rose from a convict settlement to an independent colony and was the last to be granted responsible government which it secured in 1892.

It is thus evident that all the colonies which now form the Commonwealth of Australia grew up as independent colonies which had direct relations with the Imperial Government. There was no central authority to associate the colonies in a common bond. Each Colony had its own separate system of two houses with a Governor as the head. The desire towards Federation grew up as a result of free discussion of the different views of the Imperial Government had on the subject of the movement.



initiative had been with the people and their representatives

The Legislature and the general body of electors of every colony were free to decide whether they would accept Federal Constitution or not. The Act for the establishment of Commonwealth became only possible after each colony had given its free consent through the majority vote of its Legislature and the referendum vote of the people. Queensland New South Wales Western Australia each in turn delayed to accept the federal constitution as they wanted amendments in their own interest. Mere consent of the freely elected delegates, Premiers of the different Colonies, the members of the Upper and Lower Houses was not considered a sufficient ground to accept federal constitution unless the same had been obtained by the process of referendum. Western Australia up to the last refused to enlist as member of the Commonwealth and only agreed after the Act had been passed by the British parliament at the joint request of the other five Colonies.

No Colony made an appeal to the British Government at any stage to interfere and to coerce an unwilling colony into accepting the Federal Constitution. Each colony exercised its own free will as expressed through its Premier its delegates, Legislature and electors in general to decide the question of federation. The draft bill of the Federal Constitution was

thoroughly discussed, revised and reconsidered before being finally agreed upon and there was such a unanimity on it on the part of the federating colonies when it was sent on to the British Parliament for enactment that it needed no amendment except in regard to the right of appeal to the Privy Council

Truly it can be said that the federal constitution was framed by the people of Australia with their own free consent and the Commonwealth Act of 1900 was the concession to popular will proving thereby that consent is an essential pre-requisite to the grant of freedom to a country, If the different colonies of Australia had not united on the issue of Federation and had chosen to pursue their own ways, the Commonwealth would have never been established

This essential point is often conveniently forgotten in India by the Hindus who wrongly and selfishly urge that India's integrity and indivisibility should be preserved per force by the British Government and the Muslim majority Provinces should be denied their rights to pronounce freely on the question of federation. If in case of a homogeneous people, allied by race, religion, language and tradition, Federation could not be enforced without the free consent of the federating colonies, how can 90 millions of Muslims in India, who have fundamental political differences with the Hindus, be compelled to accept a federal

constitution without being consulted as to whether it really suits their interests?

Australia is the only British Self-governing Dominion which has a true federal constitution. The Union of South Africa is a Federation in name. Its four Provinces which make up the Union are mere administrative areas which lie at the mercy of the Union Parliament. Canada too in one respect is not a true federation. Its provinces do not retain the original authority. The residuary powers are granted to the Centre while the powers of the Provinces are limited and strictly defined. The laws of the provinces are subject to revision or total rejection by the Dominion.

In Australia, the powers of the States are undefined and their laws may be disallowed only by the Imperial Parliament and are in no way under the Commonwealth control. The framers of the Commonwealth constitution were anxious as fully as possible to preserve State rights and were influenced by the American model in the allocation of power between the Centre and Provinces. As is truly said, The Commonwealth constitution is based not on the desire as far as possible to unify but rather on the granting to the States the retention of the maximum of authority compatible with the creation of a unity in any sense. But in actual practice, the relations of the Commonwealth have not been harmonious with the Provinces.

Professor Keith in his "Dominion Autonomy in Practice" admits that "powers of the Commonwealth are inadequate and that there is a serious overlapping in matters relating to labour and industrial and commercial conditions" He says that "repeated efforts have been made to induce the people to entrust to the Commonwealth the power to regulate internal trade and commerce and labour conditions in general, to control corporations of every kind, to regulate monopolies, and, where necessary, to expropriate and carry on the business concerned for the public interest But all these efforts have been defeated and the latest development is the defeat of Mr Bruce's proposal on the refusal of the States to surrender any powers, to reduce to a minimum the Commonwealth operations in respect of trade disputes "

Professor Keith criticises the Commonwealth Government In his opinion "financial relations have also disturbed the harmony between the Commonwealth and the States, and South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania have suffered rather than gained economically from federation." Further he complains that "as in Canada, the Senate has completely failed to serve any federal purpose. Its members seldom display any tendency to support the State rights against Commonwealth inroads, the only sign of their State affiliation lying in the effort to secure the

maximum benefit from federal funds for their constituents "

Those who know that Australia is entirely inhabited by people of British race homogeneous in tradition and outlook must feel a bit surprised why the individual States of the Commonwealth are so jealous of their rights and do not want to entrust the Federal Government with additional legislative and financial powers. But the reasons are not far to seek. Australia is double the size of India with barely  $7\frac{1}{2}$  millions of people. Vast areas are still undeveloped. Among the six States New South Wales and Victoria together account for more than two thirds of population. These two States still retain many of their old privileges when they were self governing colonies. The Federal Parliament has no right to veto any Bill passed by the State Legislatures. They have direct relations with the Crown through the direct appointment of their Governors by the Crown and their right of appeal to the Privy Council. Naturally these States cannot tolerate interference with their long established rights. They have accepted participation in Federation to gain additional prestige and to secure an effective voice in the exploitation of the wealth of undeveloped parts of Australia.

The comparatively undeveloped States of South and West Australia and the small island State of Tasmania have practically gained no-

thing economically by joining the Federation. Their population is still very small, while their resources in cultivable lands, forests, pasturages and mines are still mainly untapped. The gold and copper mines of Western and Southern Australia have been a great source of income to the Federal Government, while they have derived no corresponding benefit in return. Further the financial arrangements of the Commonwealth, under which it has taken over the debts of the States in lieu of customs and excise and pays subsidies to some at a fixed rate per head, has hit the States with smaller population very hard. The three old States of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland had incurred heavy debts in the past by developing their means of communication, agriculture, mining and industry and have now been relieved of their heavy burdens in lieu of their consent to make over revenue from customs and excise to the Federal Government. The three smaller States which are still mainly undeveloped have had to forego important sources of income without deriving corresponding benefit. Their debts under development schemes were comparatively insignificant while the income foregone is comparatively high. The return in the form of subsidies does not amount to much in their case as it is calculated on population figures.

A careful examination of the circumstances

leading to the formation of the Federal Constitution will reveal that it has no parallel lesson for India. The constitution is primarily meant to meet the needs of a homogeneous population allied by race, religion language and history.

Unlike the huge population of India which has a living space of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  acres per head in Australia the advantages are a hundred times as great. A small population of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  millions is assured of peace, plenty and comfort in a vast continent of 3 million square miles which is capable of accommodating 10 times the present population. The desire to share in the untapped wealth of Australia is enough to stimulate every Australian to unite under a Federal Government. Appeal to better economic interests has been the strongest unifying force to an Australian. Such an economic appeal is not possible in India. Here we may unite for an equal distribution of the wealth of India but in practice it will mean equality of all in poverty. India is not rich enough to provide a decent living to every body if its wealth is equally shared by all. So the stimulus to better the economic lot does not equally appeal to all. The people in the Punjab will always be at an advantage in the harvesting of their natural products when compared with the people in the U P or Bihar. The latter are congested Provinces and the population has reached a

stage of growth beyond which it will lead to a perpetual State of unemployment, starvation and famine. The Punjab and other Muslim areas of the North-West will not have to face the population problem for years to come. But their inhabitants will have to be on guard against the influx of half-starving people from Rajputana or the U. P.

Another factor which has influenced the people of Australia to unite has been the new danger in the rising power of Japan. The Commonwealth States are prepared to sacrifice their separate existence to face this danger. Preservation of the united strength of Australia against a common enemy is more important and vital to the interests of the people than insisting on their separate state rights. It is this new threat which had drawn the commonwealth into closer alliance with the mother-country. As long as Australia is not sufficiently strong to defend her own interests, it will continue to be the most earnest member of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The common man in India is not moved by a similar situation to press for Federation. The Congress and Hindu Mahasabha are enamoured of the ideal simply out of motives of political power and aggrandisement. To them Federation implies a permanent domination of India in the primary interest of the Hindu majority. Muslims and other minorities will be assured



of safeguards for the protection of such rights as do not come into conflict with the Hindu conception of nationalism but in the political and economic field Hindu leadership will have to be accepted and followed by all

#### IV IRELAND

Of all the self-governing Dominions Ireland alone furnishes a practical solution of the communal question in India. The Irish Free State has a unitary form of Government after the British model but its jurisdiction extends only over three fourths of Ireland the rest having its own separate government. Ireland is a small island forming a compact geographical area. It is inhabited by an English speaking people who have much in common in their culture law education and general outlook on life but who differ in their religious creeds and historic traditions. Of the 4 Divisions into which the island is divided three form the Irish Free State and the fourth is named Ulster. The population of the island is just over 4 millions of which the Roman Catholic Irish number 3 millions and the Protestant Irish 1 million.

The Protestant and Roman Catholic Irish have deep-rooted historical differences which can be traced to the time of Henry II. Henry

VIII, Elizabeth, Cromwell and William III Ireland was finally conquered in the 16th century but the people were never satisfied with the British administration. The harsh and oppressive policy of the British kings in the past is primarily responsible for the present state of affairs. The British conquest brought in its wake a large number of Protestant adventurers who dispossessed the native Irish of their lands and settled in their midst. Protestant colonies were implanted in the north of the island while in many cases lands were held by British nobles who resided in England. This led to absentee landlordism, a system which caused gradual estrangement between the Irish tenants and their British masters.

The Irish suffered from many other disabilities during the British rule. As they were Roman Catholics, they were deprived of many of the privileges which were open to Protestants. The Irish Church was dis-established and in its place, the English Episcopal Church was recognised by the State. Taxes were forcibly levied on the Roman Catholic population to pay for the establishment of the British Church.

It was not till the reign of Queen Victoria when Gladstone became Prime Minister that the Irish question was sympathetically dealt with. In 1889 the Irish church Bill was

passed which provided for the complete<sup>1</sup> disestablishment of the Episcopal Church while in the following year the Irish Land Act gave the Irish tenant compensation for the improvements effected by him before he could be evicted Gladstone intended to secure Home Rule for Ireland and made many attempts to rush the Bill through Parliament, but on each occasion he met with strong opposition from the Lords The Irish patriots were getting restless and losing all hope in peaceful methods to press their claims adopted terrorism A section of the Irish political agitators known as Sin Finners caused wide spread unrest and committed open acts of murder and robbery to paralyse administration

The British Government finally resolved to settle the Irish question once for all and in 1920 the British Parliament passed an Act under which separate parliaments were set up for Southern Ireland (26 counties) and Northern Ireland (6 counties) In the next year a treaty was signed between Great Britain and Ireland which granted to Ireland the status of a self governing Dominion in the commonwealth of nations known as the British Empire Under this treaty a provisional government was set up which met as a constituent assembly to adopt a constitution for southern Ireland to be called henceforth the Irish Free State The Constitution declares that all

powers of government and all authority, legislative, executive and judicial, in Ireland are derived from the people of Ireland. The Irish Language is declared to be the national language but English is equally recognised as an official language. All the fundamental rights, i.e., freedom of worship and conscience, freedom of speech and meeting, and the right to move and dwell at any place are guaranteed to every citizen. Elementary education is free for all children.

The Constitution originally provided for a Legislature consisting of the King, a chamber of 'Deputies and a Senate. But important amendments were carried in 1936 by the Constitution Act of that year. The Senate was abolished. The King was eliminated from the Constitution in relation to internal affairs, The Oath of Allegiance to the Constitution was also abolished in 1938. Provisions relating to a Refrendum of the people and the initiation of proposals for legislation, by the people have also been removed. Thus the Irish Chamber of Deputies holds supreme powers. The Executive consists of 5 to 12 members, including the President and the Vice-President and the Minister of Finance.

Northern Ireland maintains a separate Parliament with a Senate consisting of 24 elected and 2 ex-officio members and a House of Commons of 25 elected members. The

executive power is vested in a Governor who acts on behalf of the Crown and is advised by Ministers responsible to Parliament. The Ulster Parliament has powers to legislate for its own area except in matters of Imperial concern or those reserved to Imperial Parliament such as the Postal Service and Post office and Savings Banks. Northern Ireland continues to return 13 members to the Imperial House of Commons

A close study of the provisions in the constitutions of Northern and Southern Ireland reveals that both are essentially English in their model and advocate a parliamentary form of government based on the party system. The island as a whole could come under a democratic form of government with an executive responsible to a Central Legislature, but the Protestants of Northern Ireland did not agree to live under any system of government which would have reduced them to the position of a minority

The Protestants number 1/4 millions and are strong enough to hold their own against the Irish Catholics. They occupy the richest and the most advanced industrial part of Ireland they possess wealth and property out of proportion to their population they are backed up by the active sympathy of the British people in Great Britain. The Irish are prepared to guarantee them special rights and

their separate representation in their own Parliament if only they can combine with them for certain common purposes under a Federal Government at the Centre. The Ulster men, however, are strongly committed to a policy of separation and do not for a moment visualise a future Ireland which can unite them into a common nation.

For us in India it is clear that if a small community of a million and a quarter, which has nothing to lose practically by participation in a scheme of federation, is not prepared to give up its separate political existence, there is no reason why Indian Muslims should be forced to merge their identity into a united Indian nation which does not exist in practice.

The Protestants in Ireland merely differ from the Roman Catholics in religious creed and history, and yet they could not unite to form even a federal government. The Muslims differ from Hindus besides religion and history, in the entire outlook on life in regard to social, economic, cultural and political interests, and yet they are termed communalists if they demand self-determination for those parts of India where they are in a majority.

Sir Edward Carson formerly a Premier of Northern Ireland, once said in course of a speech that if Ulster was forcibly united to form part

of Ireland he would fight tooth and nail against this injustice. His words were received with applause by the British public and nobody condemned him as a rank communalist disturbing the peace of Ireland. Mr Jinnah says in a similar tone that Muslims will fight for Pakistan and if need be die for it but the Hindu and Anglo-Indian Press criticise him in the strongest terms.

The Muslim attitude is misunderstood and their insistence on the Pakistan Scheme is considered equivalent to putting a veto on all constitutional progress. One may ask the British statesmen if the partition of Ireland has impeded the progress of Ireland and has created a political deadlock in the relations of the two communities. The present State of friendly relations between Ulster and Irish free State is a clear proof of the good effect of partition.

As long as the Irish problem was not solved the Protestants and Roman Catholics were at daggers drawn and were ready to plunge into civil war at the slightest pretext. Since the political division of the country into two independent States, they have lived as peaceful neighbours and have forgotten all their past animosities.

The Indian problem is running exactly

on parallel lines with Ireland. Like the Irish agitators, the Congress is forcing the hands of Great Britain to establish a strong Central Government responsible to the Legislature of the country as a whole, but if Great Britain's past experience has not been acquired in vain it should apply the same methods in India as it did in dealing with the Ireland problem. The Muslims, like the Protestants of Ulster do not wish to sever their connection with the British Empire, but simply demand that their right to separate existence in the subcontinent of India be recognised. Suspicions between the two communities in India have grown so deep that separation alone can dispel them and unite them on equal terms as two friendly neighbours. If separation has failed to destroy the peace and order of Ireland there is no reason to suppose that it will plunge India into chaos and civil war. Again, if the strong hand of Great Britain as the Protector of both Northern and Southern Ireland can guarantee their internal and external security from danger and encroachment a similar protection in case of India will safeguard the Muslim and Hindu States from internal and external aggression. The experiment tried in Ireland can alone solve the tangled problem of India and establish good will and amity between the two major communities.



## 5 DEMOCRACY AND INDIA

Mr Jinnah has been severely criticised in the Hindu Press for his statement that democracy as practised in the West is not suited to the genius of India but none of the critics has taken the trouble to study dispassionately the argument pointed out by Mr Jinnah in support of his assertion. It will be a shock to the critics to learn that Pt Jawaharlal Nehru one of the foremost Congress leaders shares the views of Mr Jinnah and admits in clear terms in his book "Glimpses of World History" that old-time Democracy has broken down and Parliament is on the decline."

In a chapter under the heading The Failure of Parliaments Pandit Jawaharlal analyses the reasons why Parliamentary system of government has proved a failure in the West and suggests as a panacea the adoption of a socialist and economic programme on the lines of Soviet Russia. Tracing out post war events after 1918 he explains two outstanding facts i.e. the failure of Labour and old type of socialism during the post war years, and the failure or decline of parliaments. He considers Western Democracy as a handmaid of capitalism and concludes "Fascism spreads wherever capitalism is in danger and faces Com-

munism or the possibility of it. Between the two, parliamentary government goes to pieces" Thus according to him capitalism when threatened by Communism may seek protection in Fascism as has been done in Italy and Germany or it may remain entrenched in a strong position supported by the upper classes as has been done in England, France and the U.S.A. He cites the typical case of England to prove that Democracy only exists in name and that parliament is losing its influence and prestige. He argues thus —

"The English way of doing things is very different from the Continental method. Always they try to keep up old appearances, and the changes are thus not very obvious. To an ordinary observer the British Parliament continues as before, but as a matter of fact it has changed greatly. In the old days the House of Commons exercised power directly, and the average member had a good say in the matter. Now it is the Cabinet or the Government that decides every big question, and the House of Commons can only say yes or no to it. Of course the House can turn out the Government by saying "no", but this is a drastic step which is seldom taken, as it would result in a lot of trouble and a general election. So that if a Government has got a majority in the House of Commons, it can do almost anything it likes and get the House to agree to it and

thus make it law. Power has thus been transferred, and is still being transferred from the legislature to the executive.

Continuing Pt. Jawaharlal says. Again there is so much work to be done by Parliament nowadays so many complicated questions to be faced, that a practice has grown for Parliament to decide only the general principles of any measure or law and to leave it to the executive government or to some department of it to fill the details. In this way the executive has got enormous powers and can do what it likes in an emergency. Parliament is thus getting more out of touch with important activities of the State. Its chief functions are now being reduced to criticism of Government measures, questions and enquiries and finally approval of the general policy of the government. As Harold J Laski says, "Our government has become an executive dictatorship tempered by fear of Parliamentary revolt."

Pt. Jawaharlal further elucidates the failure of Democracy by quoting the concrete example of Ireland. He writes "Thus in England also old time democracy has broken down and Parliament is on the decline. Democracy fails when vital issues which move people's passion have to be faced such as religious clashes or national and racial (Aryan and German versus

Jews) and above all economic conflicts (between the Haves and the Have-Nots) You will remember that when such a religio-national issue arose in Ireland between Ulster and the rest in 1914, the British Conservative Party actually refused to accept Parliament's decision and even encouraged civil war. Thus so long as an apparently democratic procedure serves the purpose of the possessing classes, they use it to their advantage to protect their own interests. When this comes in their way and challenges their special privileges and interests, then they discard democracy, and take to methods of dictatorship. It is quite possible that the British Parliament might, in the future get a majority in favour of sweeping social changes. If such a majority attacks vested interests, the owners of these interests may repudiate Parliament itself and even encourage a revolt against its decision, as they did in 1914 over the Ulster issue."

The Pandit becomes more clear when he condemns present-day democracy. He says "So we see that parliament and democracy are only considered desirable by the possessing classes so long as they maintain existing conditions. That is, of course, no real democracy, it is the exploitation of democratic idea for undemocratic purposes. Real democracy has had no chance to exist so far, for there is an essential contradiction between the capitalist

system and democracy Democracy if it means anything means equality not merely the equality of possessing a vote but economic and social equality Capitalism means the very opposite a few people holding economic power and using this to their own advantage They make laws to keep their own position secure and anybody who breaks these laws becomes a disturber of law and order whom society must punish. Thus there is no equality under this system, and the liberty allowed is only within the limits of capitalist laws meant to preserve capitalism

Now it follows from the paragraphs quoted freely above that England with the longest and most stable traditions of democracy has failed to develop a real form of democracy that the British system of government is in essence a capitalist democracy wherein all economic and political power is concentrated in the hands of upper classes It is obvious that British democracy cannot serve as a model for the future government of India and that the popular vote known as the adult franchise will simply lead to the exploitation of the illiterate masses by the privileged classes The Hindus by their very nature as a caste ridden community, with great social differences and with capitalist tendencies slowly developed in course of centuries cannot be entrusted to develop real democracy in India. As Pandit Jawaharlal

has himself admitted democracy is meaningless without social and economic equality, both of which are lacking in India. The Depressed Classes and the Muslims have repeatedly emphasised this point but the Congress which is at present the close preserve of the Hindu upper and middle classes, including money-lenders, Baniyas and traders, has so far done nothing to allay their misapprehensions.

Pt. Jawaharlal truly represents the opinion of every sane thinker when he says, "Not only Communists and Fascists but many others, who have thought over the troubles of the present age, have become dissatisfied with the old idea of giving a vote and calling it a democracy." Continuing he expands this idea thus, "Democracy means equality, and democracy can only flourish in an equal society. It is obvious enough that the giving of votes to every body does not result in producing an equal society. In spite of adult suffrage and the like, there is to-day tremendous inequality. Therefore, in order to give democracy a chance, an equal society must be created, and this reasoning leads there to various other ideals and methods. But all these people agree that present-day parliaments are highly unsatisfactory."

In face of these sweeping remarks, can any one doubt Mr. Jinnah when he boldly asserted the truth so plainly admitted by Pandit

Jawaharlal that Western type of democracy is not suited to the genius of India.

Let me quote from some of the statements of Mr Jinnah which were reported in the Press. The Civil and Military Gazette of November 9 1939 thus reports Mr Jinnah's speech at Bombay—"Mr Jinnah next refuted the cry that the Muslim League had denounced democracy Democracy in the abstract was quite different from democracy as practised Democracy was like the chameleon changing its complexion according to the environment. Democracy was not the same in England as it was in France or America. Islam believed in equality liberty and fraternity but not the democracy of the western type—the Democratic Parliamentary system in which party government was the basic principle of the constitution Such a system had failed in India where the Hindus were in a majority of three to one against the Muslims.

"Mr Jinnah next proceeded to examine the democratic nature of the Congress organisation "Is it democracy if a Grand Fascist Council sitting in Wardah issues orders to Ministers in the provinces who are responsible to the legislature? And the sole and final dictator of this Grand Fascist Council is not even a four anna member of this democratic organisation. I ask those who preach truth

to face problems, problems for which there is no parallel in the world”

In a previous statement reported in the same paper of October 26, 1939, copy of a letter from Mr Jinnah to the “Manchester Guardian” is reproduced. It reads thus. “It is difficult to make an average Englishman understand fully the position which is facing us Muslims today. The Muslims have always had their fears and apprehensions of even a representative form of government, and far more of democracy in its strict application to India. Since the time of Minto-Morley Reforms of 1908 and the historical Lucknow Pact between Hindus and Muslims in 1916 their insistence on separate electorates, weightage and statutory safeguards have been a clear indication of their fears. But since the inauguration of the new provincial constitution, it has been established beyond doubt that the Congress High Command has pursued its policies and programmes the sole aim and object of which is to annihilate every other political party and to set itself up as a Fascist and authoritarian organisation of the worst type”

— “Having regard to the 35 million voters, the bulk of whom are totally ignorant, illiterate and untutored, living in centuries-old superstitions of the worst type, thoroughly antagonistic to each other culturally and socially, the working of the constitution has clearly brought out that it is impossible to work a democratic parlia-



tary government in India. It has definitely resulted in a permanent communal majority government ruling over minorities exercising its powers and functions and utilising the machinery of government to establish the domination and supremacy of the majority community over minorities.

Therefore in my judgment apart from other reasons into which I need not go in detail democracy can only mean Hindu Raj all over India. This is a position to which Muslims will never submit."

From a careful comparison the statements of the two leaders Pt. Jawahar Lal and Mr Jinnah it is easy to conclude that both have no faith in the western type of democracy and both consider a parliamentary system of government unworkable in its present form. They however suggest different remedies to contract the evil influence of present day democracy. Pt. Jawahar Lal suggests economic and social equality of the voter which according to him is not possible simply by the giving of vote to every body. Adult franchise in his opinion will strengthen the hands of possessing classes to exploit the masses in the interests of Capitalism. He pleads for a socialist order on Soviet lines which alone according to him can wrest real economic power from Capitalism and establish a peasants and workers government on truly democratic

lines Nobody, however, will accept this interpretation of true democracy as really consistent with the present trend in Congress policies which is dominated by Rightists It appears that either Pt Jawahar Lal has changed his views in regard to Socialism or he has deliberately cloaked his real intentions to gain popularity among the Rightists Else there is no justification why he should not have sided with the Leftists or the party represented by Mr. Subhas Chandar Bose

Another paradox which baffles ones' reasoning is why Pt Jawahar Lal is so keen for the idea of a Constituent Assembly. For a man who thinks that democracy fails when vital issues which move people's passions have to be faced, it seems a mystery that he should consider it the cure of all our ills at present Does Pt. Jawahar Lal think that giving of vote to every body will create an equal society, independent of the social and economic inequality? Does it auger well for real democracy which Pt. Jawahar Lal has in mind that the masses should be exploited by the Congress bourgeois and upper classes To quote his words "The much-paraded vote given to the masses gave them only the choice of saying once in 4 or 5 years whether a certain person X might rule over them and exploit them or another person Y should do so. In either event the masses were to be exploited by the ruling class"

Now to turn to Mr. Jinnah. He does not play a double role like Pt. Jawahar Lal being a socialist at one time and a Rightist at another. He is opposed to Western type of democracy for India as a single political unit as it will lead to the exploitation of the minorities and the concentration of political and economic power in the hands of a communal majority aggressive and capitalist in its outlook. He lays emphasis on the political social and economic equality of all communities as this is the only way to prevent one community from being dominated by the other. He advises Congress to face the realities of the Indian situation and to come to terms with the Muslims. India is not the home of a homogeneous nation nor again its political destiny is the sole concern of the Congress. The Muslims with a majority in 4 out of 11 provinces have every right to be consulted before any future constitution is devised and if due to Congress intransigence they are forced to press the scheme of separation they are fully justified on the principle of self determination.

## PART III

# COMMUNALISM

### 1. POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CAUSES OF HINDU-MUSLIM DIFFERENCES.

[ I ]

Some people think that religion alone is the root-cause of the present day Hindu-Muslim differences and that there can be no real political unity unless religion is separated from Politics and is subordinated to the interests of the State.

Swami Sampurnanand, a former Minister of Education in the U.P. and a prominent Congress leader once declared in a speech that India could not achieve national unity as long as Hindus and Muslims clung to their separate cultures and that it should be the aim of all true nationalists to build a common culture on the ruins of the two old cultures. What he really meant was to establish a government in India on Soviet model in which the interests of workers and peasants would predominate and religion would lose all its importance. Many

Hindus are the dominant people and constitute the real Indian nation and that the Muslims and other communities can be assigned the status of permanent minorities only. Both these parties claim the political domination of India on the basis of their numerical strength. They demand a democratic constitution based on adult franchise. The Muslims are told that religion is a private matter that concerns the personal relations of a man with his Creator. It has nothing to do with political or economic affairs that come entirely within the function of a modern state. To confound them still further unity conferences are held and various plans are discussed to attain Hindu Muslim unity. The underlying idea in all these moves is that India is one indivisible country and that Hindus and Muslims can sink their differences to unite for common end. To make the propaganda effective Muslim quislings have specially been engaged who under inspiration from the astute Mahatma or purely for their own personal ends vie with one another in winning the favour of their Congress masters.

Now I do not deny that religion is a real obstacle in the way of India's political unity if that means the domination of one community by the other but I do not believe that the separation of religion from politics or the summoning of Unity Conferences can settle

the Hindu-Muslim problem on a permanent footing. It may be possible to make religion subservient to the interests of a State, though this may be fundamentally opposed to Islamic conception, but even then there is no guarantee that the political or economic differences of the two communities can ever be reconciled as long as they are tagged on against their own consent to the same state. In England, religion was subservient to the State in the 17th century, and the people were all united by ties of race, religion and language, but this did not prevent the country from plunging into civil war. The political differences had assumed such importance that they could only be settled through war. The Royalists wanted a strong government at the Centre, with the King supreme in power but the Commons wanted a limited monarchy, with the supreme power vested in parliament. Similarly in the U. S. A., France, and Russia political differences led to far-reaching results. The Civil War of America directly arose out of the political aspirations of the Southern States to dominate the Centre by increasing the number of slave-owning States. It was not religion but the conflicting political and economic interests of the States that caused this upheaval.

★  
France before the Revolution presented a similar case. The political and economic interests of the upper and lower classes came into

serious conflict. The clergy and the nobility formed privileged orders and shared all political power out of proportion to their numerical strength. Hence the masses who had become conscious of their own importance, rose in arms against the king and the privileged orders.

Czarist Russia before the last war was an absolute monarchy. The workers and peasants were discontented and were groaning under heavy taxation. Hence they sought their opportunity in the defeat of Russian armies to rise against their government.

In all these cases political differences arose among the Members of a homogeneous state who were allied by race, religion language and culture and yet nothing less than war could settle their differences finally. The people of these States believed in the separation of religion from politics and there was no dearth of intellectuals among them who could have tried to compose their political differences.

Now if this is true in case of a homogeneous state that when political differences assume a serious turn there is no other alternative but to settle them through war how much more it is true in case of India which is not a homogeneous state and where the Muslims are sharply divided from Hindus not

merely by religion, language or culture but by political and economic interests. In a homogeneous State, undoubtedly fundamental political differences do not ordinarily lead to the permanent division of the country into two or more states, though here too if the people living together in a compact part hold their views fundamentally opposed to those living in the rest of the country, separation has been a possibility. Scandinavia, Iberian Peninsula, Netherlands, China, Ireland are all single geographical units and the living-space of homogeneous peoples allied by all the tests of a modern nationality. Scandinavia broke up in due course into Sweden and Norway, Iberian Peninsula into Spain and Portugal, Netherlands into Holland and Belgium, Ireland into Ulster and Irish Free State. China to despite the homogeneity of its people through more or less ties of a common race, language and history was split up into three parts prior to its invasion by Japan. There were two governments functioning side by side at Nanking and Canton, while Manchuria and the North with Peiping as the centre was also a separate entity for all practical purposes. Even recently despite the danger of a common enemy, certain Provinces of China had turned Communist and did not acknowledge the authority of the Nationalist Chinese Government at Chungking.

India does not fall in the category of homogeneous states. In the diversity of its races,



languages and religions it resembles the Turkish, Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires before the last war. The Sultans of Turkey for centuries continued to rule over compact territories inhabited by Christians, Jews and Muslims but they could never weld the peoples into a united nation. The movement of the Young Turks prior to the last war to ottomanise all the subject peoples and to develop the idea of a common political nationality met with no better success. The Committee of the Union and progress which aimed at preserving the integrity and indivisibility of the Ottoman Empire succeeded at first in attracting the attention of the minorities.

The movement for unity and reform was supported alike by Jews, Greeks, Armenians, Turks and Arabs. In fact the Turkish Revolution of 1908 which resulted in the final overthrow of the absolute monarchy in Turkey and the establishment of a limited monarchy with a parliamentary form was financed by the Jews and Greeks. But the Empire's fate was sealed. The principle of self-determination had encouraged hopes among the minorities of Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires after the last war and the minorities of Turkey could not fail to be affected by it. Hence there arose on the break up of the Empire a number of new States in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, Hejaz, and Armenia. The last named finally shifted

its territories to Trans-Caucasia where Armenia now forms a constituent republic of the Soviet Russia.

## [ II ]

In ancient times when India was split up into a number of independent kingdoms and principalities, it was not religion that was responsible for its vivisection. At first the political interests of dominant clans demanded that they should carve out for themselves independent states, subsequently, as various clans and tribes had settled in different parts of India, the idea of kingship developed into absolute monarchy and the ruling dynasties gained the supreme political power of their respective states.

During the Rajput Period in History the Rajputs were the dominant race in the northern half of India and had established independent kingdoms of their own. On the decline of the Moghul Empire, the Mahrattas, Rajputs and Sikhs raised their heads and succeeded in wresting large parts from the declining no better success.

For a time it appeared that Hindus would achieve political unity under the rising power of the Mahratta confideracy. But the mutual rivalries and jealousies of the Mahratta chiefs themselves and the conflicting interest of other groups like Rajputs, Sikhs and Jats etc., dealt a

death-blow to Hindu solidarity and it became evident that the Marhattas had failed to establish a Hindu empire with a common central government. If the British had not arrived on the scene, India would have been divided into numerous Hindu and Muslim states which in due course would have settled down as peaceful neighbours.

It will thus be evident that the vivisection of India in the past, both during the Hindu and Muslim Period, was never due to religion but to the political differences or ambitions of the ruling dynasties or dominant clans and tribes. If India to-day is again divided on the principle of self-determination, why should religion be held responsible for it? It is the political differences which are really responsible for the Muslim separation movement. The Muslims feel that their political and economic interests will be better served by separation than by union. If they accept the theory of a united Indian nation, they will be reduced to the status of a minority which will have to depend upon the favour of the majority community for the protection of its rights. They will not be able to exercise a substantial and powerful influence at the Centre where the Hindus will be placed in permanent possession of power on the basis of their majority in population.

All the vital organs of a national State—Foreign affairs, Army, Navy, Air Communications, Customs and Finance etc., will become

central subjects which will be controlled by a cabinet responsible to a Legislature dominated by Hindu element. It is the fear that with the termination of British rule, Hindus will gain supreme political power through sheer weight of numbers and would use it to exploit Muslims who have already been economically enslaved by them, that compels the Indian Muslims to demand independence for the national homelands where they may develop independent sovereign States unhampered by others.

These Muslim fears are not a mere figment of imagination on their parts. Events of the last 150 years have proved, that with the gradual passing of power from British to Indian hands, the Hindu has grown more and more overbearing and arrogant in his treatment towards minorities. He has developed such an intense love for an aggressive type of nationalism that one can hardly distinguish between him and a Japanese or a German in this respect. Outwardly, he preaches democracy and the cult of modern nationalism with its high-sounding phrases and inspiring slogans, but in reality he is working to organise the Hindu community with a view to wresting the supreme political power from the British. The Muslims would not object to any ambitious programme that the Hindus might devise to promote the interests of their own community, but they will not accept

a position of political subservience to the very community which in the past has exploited them economically

The talk of a united India is as jarring to their ears as the talk of a united Europe may be for the nations which have been enslaved by Hitler. A united India under a common central government can never be expected to deal justly with 90 millions of Muslims who even when united will be outvoted by 4 to one in the Central Legislature.

7

The Muslim case has its parallel in Finland. The Finns are a small minority of 3 millions in European Russia but they will see the whole of Russia enslaved rather than lose their independence. In the present Russo German War the Finns know that Germany is the aggressor but they are siding with Germany as Russia had aggressive designs on them. Similarly if the Hindus in their desire for independence transgress the limits of decency and have designs on predominantly Muslim areas, the Muslims will rather prefer to have the independence of India delayed than to join in hastening their own permanent enslavement. You cannot blame a Finn if he joins Russia's enemy for fear of losing his own independence similarly the Indian Muslim cannot be blamed if he refuses to join Congress for fear of enslaving his own community. The Russians are pre-

pared to give the Finns complete provincial autonomy if they merge their country into a united Russia, but they will not be moved by any considerations, however alluring they may be, to change their independence for subservience. Similarly, the Muslims will not be lured by the offer of provincial autonomy and safeguards to lose their political importance as a nation entitled to separate national existence.

Muslims have fundamental differences with Hindus in regard to the political future of the country. India is a sub-continent, comparable to Europe in population and exceeding it in the diversity of races, religions and languages. Muslims are not a minority in the sense in which the term is understood in the West. They are concentrated in separate homelands in two well-defined regions. There can be no compromise with the Hindus on this point. The Congress may hire Muslim Quislings or it may overawe Muslim opportunists to sing to its tune, but it will never succeed in suppressing the Muslim demand for Pakistan.

The present international situation may make it necessary for Muslims to co-operate with the Government in meeting the common danger, but they will extend such aid as members of a separate nation and not as the camp-followers of Congress.

factor in the separation of the Roman Catholic Belgians from the Protestant Dutch the Catholic Irish from the Protestant Irish the Muslim Arab from the Christian Arab in Syria but this factor in itself was not sufficient to decide the issue There were other more powerful factors calling for separation Differences in past history and traditions had caused an estrangement in the political and economic outlook of the communities inhabiting their countries and they sought development of their respective interests unhampered by interference from others

Another lesson from the examples cited above is that though political differences were not influenced by religion except in a few cases as in Ireland, Syria and the Netherlands yet they could not prevent these countries from plunging into civil war or breaking up into separate parts

The Congress Socialists of India are really wrong in thinking that presenting a common front against religion and by diverting public attention to a socialistic programme in which religion will be assigned a permanently subordinate position they can win over the confidence of the Muslim masses and create in them the desire for India's political unity The Congress Rightists too are equally wrong in thinking that if religion is considered as a matter of

private belief, freedom of worship is permitted and a spirit of toleration is encouraged, Hindu-Muslim differences will be made up. As I pointed out previously, religion alone is not responsible for the present strained relations of the two communities. We must seek for real causes elsewhere.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in a letter dated May 14, 1933 which has been published in his book, 'The Glimpses of History' thus diagnoses the basic differences that have caused an open split between the two major communities. "The Hindus were on the whole the better-off community. Having taken to English education earlier, they had got most of the Government jobs. They were richer also. The village financier or banker was the Bania, who exploited the small land-holders and tenants and gradually reduced them to beggary and himself took possession of the land. The Bania exploited Hindu and Muslim tenants and land-holders alike, but his exploitation of the Muslim took a communal turn especially in provinces where the agriculturists were mainly Muslims. The spread of machinemade goods probably hit the Muslims harder than the Hindus as there were relatively more artisans among Muslims. All these factors went to increase the bitterness between the two major communities of India and to strengthen Muslim nationalism which looked to the community rather than to the country."



It follows from the paragraph quoted above that there were two main differences between the two communities (1) economic and (2) political. In the economic field, the tension is most acute in provinces where peasants are mostly Muslims and money lenders mostly Hindus. In the political field the Muslim middle class is mostly affected as it has been shut out from its due share in trade and services owing to the exclusive tendencies of Hindus.

Maulana Mohammad Ali expressed the Muslim viewpoint very clearly when he said in course of his speech at the Round Table Conference in London "Let me assure every British man and woman who thinks of shaping our destinies that the only quarrel between the Hindu and the Muslim to day is a quarrel that the Muslim is afraid of Hindu domination I want to get rid of that fear"

This speech was uttered on 19th November 1929. Since then the split between the Congress and the Muslim League has been growing wider and wider and the majority community has utterly failed to win the confidence of the Muslims. The opportunity that was given to it under the new constitution in the Congress governed provinces was simply wasted in the pursuit of a so-called national programme which included among other things the singing of the Bande Matram song the hoisting of the Congress Tricolour flag the

promotion of Hindī and the Wardha Scheme of Education, the deliberate exclusion of the Muslim League from Provincial Cabinets and the encouragement of Muslim mass contact campaign

It is no use minimising the importance of political differences by using the socialists' argument that these are a creation of the upper classes and that the masses are not concerned with politics. The late Ahrai leader, Ch Afzal Haq, tried to minimise the political issue by over-emphasising the economic issue. He thus states his views in his book on Pakistan and Untouchability "Partition of India is in fact the cry of the upper classes of all the three communities. It is not a communal demand but a stunt in order that the poor classes may not concentrate their thoughts and energies on all important questions of social and economic justice." He admits that "Muslims now refuse to live as serfs of the Hindus economically and as their untouchables socially," and yet he does not feel that the Muslim demand for separation is urged by their sense of social and economic inequality in an India of Congress imagination.

His misconceptions are due to a misreading of the real situation. Social and economic equality cannot be achieved without political power. It may be kept as an ideal to stir up the masses, but it should not stand in the way

people will only be benefited when wealth is redistributed and untouchability removed? If the existence of these two evils does not prevent the Congress from laying the claim to represent all Indians including upper middle and low classes of people how can the Muslim League be blamed if it also claims to present all classes of Muslims?

The goal before Hindus and Muslims is complete independence with this difference that while the former claims sovereignty over his own part as well as the Muslim part of India on the plea of a united Indian nation the Muslims frankly admit that they are a separate nation and must have the right to self determination in the Muslim portions of India. It is thus the political issue which is bound to play the most decisive part in determining the future of India.

Such fundamental political differences as exist between Congress and Muslim League in India at present would have certainly been resolved by war or by an appeal to reason if they had arisen in another country. It is only the controlling hand of the British Government which is perforce keeping the two communities united. Muslims know full well that if no communal settlement is arrived at with Hindus independence will lead the country into civil war. Hence to avoid this they are using every means in their power to resolve their diffe

rences with Hindus in a peaceful manner. They do not believe in the principle, "independence of India first and communal war afterwards for the settlement of political differences"

No Muslim political organisation, be it even the Muslim League, can rouse the Muslims on this principle without presenting them first with a clear-cut political ideal for the future. The issue of Pakistan has become a rallying point for them. To deny its force and importance is to misread the Muslim mind.

Muslim missionaries task was extremely difficult. They could appeal to the lower orders could not win over the upper classes as that would have deprived the latter of the material advantages they enjoyed within the Hindu fold and at the same time excited against them the hostility of the Brahmans.

Thus the process of fusion between Hindu and Muslims received a severe check in the caste system and led to a definite cleavage between those who accepted Islam and those who stuck to their old religion. It is absolutely wrong to think, as the "Tribune" writes in his leader on January 9 1941 that "the differences between Hindus and Muslims if any are confined to religion which many of them have changed or rechanged. If religion meant simply the observance of a particular belief and form of worship as is the case among Christians one could easily accept this view. But the facts point to the contrary. Both Hindus and Muslims have accepted religions which besides being spiritual in the strictest sense, prescribe a definite code of laws or a set of customs and practices to be followed at every stage of life. Hinduism not merely stands for a private creed but the whole system of political, social, economic and religious aspects of life. Similarly a Muslim has very clear cut concepts about his status in the various phases of life.

Let me illustrate this point by an example. Suppose a Hindu is converted to Islam. What

The picture drawn above does not show a homogeneous people in India. Why then blame the British Government for the creation of differences ? The fault of the British lies in conquering India bit by bit, uniting it under a common system of government and giving it a geographical name which never existed in the past to define the whole of this sub-continent. The British came to India at a time when it had lost what little political unity it had attained under the Moghul rule. But for the British conquest, India would have remained a collection of warring states which in course of time might have yielded to the force of public opinion and been readjusted on the basis of religious, cultural and linguistic unity of each. The territories in the north-west, where the Sikhs dominated prior to the British, would have ultimately been united into a strong state where the Sikhs would have been forced to accept the voice of the Muslim majority and been content with the position of a junior partner in administration. Similarly Bengal and Assam, under the Muslim Nawabs, would have grown into a strong State dependent for

its power upon the united strength of 30 millions of Muslims

If any community should feel aggrieved against the British rule it is the Muslims alone. Prior to British rule they held under them the most fertile parts of India which accounted for more than two thirds of the population. Bengal, Behar, Orissa and Assam were ruled by a Muslim Nawab. Oudh and Rohilkhand were under their respective Muslim rulers. The Carnatic, Hyderabad, Mysore and southern part of Madras Presidency still acknowledged the sway of Muslim Princes while Sind was governed by its own Amirs.

The British not merely destroyed the hostile Muslim States but even refused to recognise the continued independence of those Muslim States which had been on friendly terms with them. The annexation of the Carnatic and Oudh could not be defended on moral grounds. Compare this treatment with that meted out to Hindu States. The Marhattas fought against the British in three long and difficult wars and yet the British restored to their chiefs the greater part of what they ruled over. The Gaekwar of Baroda, Scindia of Gwalior, Holkar of Indore were all left intact in possession of solid and compact territories in Maharashtra and Gujarat, over 300 chiefs were recognised as rightful masters.

of their lands, while the State of Mysore which had been conquered from Tipu Sultan was restored to the old Hindu Raja. Even the Sikhs were not unfairly dealt with. A population of 4 millions still has to its credit a number of Sikh States representing more than half their total population

The present-day political unity of India is entirely the British creation. Muslims were never a party to it, nor even the Hindus were at first ready to accept it. It is only a later development in Indian politics that Hindus have begun to insist on the indivisibility of India. Many parts of India still have no political connection with it. Nepal and Bhutan in the north enjoy practically complete independence. Important parts of the sea-coast are held by the French and Portuguese. Ceylon, which the Hindus have so often claimed to be a part of India, has direct relations with the British Crown while Burma was only recently separated. All this points out in clear terms that India is not a single geographical entity, as the Hindus claim it to be.

If there can be any justification for the independence of Nepal, Bhutan and Ceylon or for the separation of Burma, there is no reason why the predominant Muslim areas in the North West and North-East, which are self-sufficient and geographically well-defined,



should not be allowed to develop into independent self-governing States. The Muslims cannot accept the political unity of India which was achieved with the primary object of providing administrative facilities to the governing nation

The present provincial divisions of India were in most cases haphazardly planned and represent no historic boundaries. Muslims simply want readjustment of India and proper distribution of power at the Centre. If the goal is freedom from British rule, then there is no necessity in keeping the Muslim areas tagged on to the Hindu Centre against their will.

It is surprising to a Muslim that while the Hindus admit that communal differences exist yet they suggest fantastic remedies to uproot what they call the "bane of communalism". None but a fool can believe that if communal electorates are abolished Hindus and Muslims will fraternise as brothers and forget their political rivalries. The Hindus must realise that communal differences are bound to grow with the growth of political consciousness among the people. As long as power was in the hands of the British officialdom and the masses had not yet been stirred by modern education the Hindus and Muslims were content to pull on together smoothly. One

community found consolation for its loss of political power in the comparative backwardness of the other. But with the inauguration of the reforms and the possibility of a gradual wresting of power from the British, competition between the two communities has grown keener. Every educated person knows what the possession of political power means these days.

The conception of a modern State implies fundamental changes in the old notions of government. A modern State interferes in every detail of public life, no legislation, declaration of rights, or safeguards can prevent it from extending its influence and enforcing its decisions on the people. The State is all in all. Religion has no right to exist if it comes into conflict with a State. Minorities cannot be tolerated if their presence is considered to be a source of weakness for the body politic.

The immense power gained by the Congress under the dictatorship of Mahatma Gandhi has further deepened the suspicions of Muslims against the Congress. While he lays emphasis on the need of unity on a political basis, his very life shows that he lives to justify and revive the ancient Hindu practices and rites. The Hindus do not look upon him as a political leader, but a saint who seeks

inspiration from God in every political act. This game of duplicity on the part of the Mahatma has lowered him in the esteem of Muslims. He should have no reservation in declaring himself a Hindu first and last but while he acts as a Hindu should do he declares publicly that he follows the teachings of all religions that he stands for the interests of all classes, and that the salvation of the country lies in accepting his political creed. Muslims cannot accept his leadership unless they are prepared to assign him the double role of a spiritual and political leader for all times.

The real solution of our difficulties lies in a frank admission of the communal differences and in avoiding all attempts to create a united nation which can never exist in the midst of fundamentally conflicting interests. It must again be plainly recognised that neither Hindus are entitled to govern the whole of India nor can the Muslims claim more than what is due to them on population basis.

The other minorities do not occupy compact areas and are scattered over large distances and cannot form independent States on any modern test. Unless it is definitely conceded that no political advance is possible without first mutually adjusting the political relations of the major communities, tension is bound to grow and the goal of independence will not be attained.

Let the saner elements among the Hindus ponder over this, if they are genuine in their desire for independence. Muslims can only assure them of their full help if the principle of Pakistan is definitely accepted as a future line of demarcation in the relations of the two communities. Two neighbours enjoying an equal status can become better friends than two neighbours forced to unite against their will. A change in the mental outlook of caste-Hindus will alone usher in an era of peace and prosperity in this land of heterogeneous elements where man has been pitted against man as part of his religious duty. Without this mental change, it is too early to predict that democracy can ever flourish in a community which in the past has denied the ordinary social rights to more than a third of its own numbers.

Lastly to the allegation of Raja Narindra Nath that the British Government is alone responsible for the problem of communalism, I reply in the words of Sir Sikander Hayat Khan quoted from his Zonal Scheme for India "To those who belong to the second category i.e., the sceptics who doubt the bona fides of the British Government, my answer is that we have within the short space of two decades obtained two instalments of political reforms, first in 1920 under the Montague-Chelmsford Scheme and the second and a more substantial one re-

cently with the introduction of the Government of India Act of 1935. The next and final instalment cannot be long delayed if we could only remove obstacles which are of our own creation and which can be removed only by ourselves. It would not do indeed it would be dishonest to put the blame on the British Government for setting up those obstacles. Let me cite one outstanding instance. Is it not humiliating and painful to witness that since the advent of the New Constitution every single organisation, communal or political, is feverishly busy in trying to consolidate its own position vis-a-vis the other communities and at their expense in order to obtain power and supremacy over others?"

Continuing Sir Sikander says that the communal problem is admitted by all concerned to be the most formidable hurdle in the way of our political advance and yet we find prominent leaders exhibiting a callous indifference to this vital question. Unless we set our house in order by establishing inter-communal harmony and mutual confidence and good will between the British Indian Units and Indian States, it is futile to yearn for an immediate attainment of our cherished ideal of an autonomous and united India.

### 3. MR AMERY'S SPEECH ON INDIA FIRST.

Mr. Amery, the Secretary of State for India in his luncheon speech in London on December 12, 1940 commends to all communities and interests in this sub continent the watchword of "India First" in their relations to each other or to the British Government. The speech, besides being self-contradictory in its main object, also indicates a sudden climb-down from his previous luncheon speech in London on November 21.

The present speech seems to have been inspired by a desire on his part to appease the Congress and Hindu Mahasabha by conceding substantially to their point of view, while the previous speech was meant to convince the Muslims that their fears could be dispelled by "the most frank and far-reaching consideration of the methods which we and they have been accustomed to take for granted" and "by a study of other constitutional precedents than our own."

In the present speech, the responsibility for political deadlock in India is thrown jointly on the Congress and the League for "their insistence on impracticable demands on the one

side or undue suspicion on the other. In the previous speech, the deadlock was justified as the result of an instinctive development along lines which our (British) peculiar history and local conditions have made successful in this country and the Dominions in the wholly different and far more complex conditions of India.

Again in the present speech, he advises a follower of Congress to win over his Muslim neighbour by having some compromise with him "which would enable him to feel that his community will surely enjoy in the future India as real a freedom and as full a development of its individual, communal and cultural entity as his own". But the inconsistency of this advice becomes evident when he supports the same follower of Congress in his preferences for a democratic system on the simple majority basis that prevails in England and a closely knit centralised constitution. In his previous speech he expressed his strong fears that the Congress could not become democratic in outlook without doing grave injustice to Muslims. He defined thus the Congress attitude. The Congress demands a national government at once and envisages the framing of a new constitution by a constituent assembly based on universal suffrage but Congress leaders have not explained how these demands

could be met without a grave injustice to the minority parties including Muslims."

One other point in the present speech, in striking contrast with the tone of a previous speech in the House of Commons deserves notice. He admits on the one hand "the right of a Muslim to assert that his community be recognised as a permanent element in India's national life and not as a mere numerical minority" but at the same time he accuses the Muslim of "pressing this claim to the point of imposing a veto on all political progress."

One fails to understand in what way the Muslims' desire to press their claim for recognition as a major and distinct political community stands in the way of India's political progress. The real issue which is the root cause of the present political tension in India, is the Congress claim to be recognised as the sole and authoritative organisation of the whole of India. All other problems and complexities have resulted from this exclusive outlook on the part of Congress.

Even Mr. Amery in a previous speech in the House of Commons on 21st November strongly criticised this attitude of the Congress and held it responsible for the present political deadlock. I repeat at length extracts from his speech to enable the reader to judge for himself who stands in the way of India's political progress:



reconcile its differences with the Muslim League no self respecting Muslim leader can ever agree to serve under conditions imposed by it. The Congress attitude in the words of Mr Amery is that of all or nothing. The Muslims would have no objection if the Congress could unite the Hindu majority Provinces to form a strong government at the Centre but they cannot be coerced to merge the future of Muslim Provinces in a united India at the dictation of Congress.

If in the next elections the Muslim community returns only such members to Provincial Legislatures as are committed to a creed of separation who one earth can coerce them to accept a state of utter subjection in a united India which according to Mr Amery would mean an India governed by the Congress on Congress lines. If Mr Amery cannot accept a future India under the domination of Congress how can he expect the same of the Muslims, who have a far greater stake in the future than the British people or their Government? Mr Amery then with the true foresight of a seer plainly recognised the difficulties in an India of Congress conception when he repeated the historic words "To accept that position or even to move towards it would at once create infinite trouble in India and would go far towards threatening all hopes of bringing about a self governing India."

Mr. M. A. Jinnah fully agrees with him in this respect. In his speech at Karachi on December 15 he said, "Mr. Gandhi's, the Congress's, and the Hindu Mahasabha's demands not only involve immediate fundamental constitutional changes of a far-reaching character, but have for their basic principle, avowedly the domination of a permanent Hindu majority even for the formation of a provisional government. If the British Government surrenders to these demands it means that the Muslims and other minorities must come under the yoke of congress hegemony and act according to and submit to the will of the Congress."

Continuing, Mr. Jinnah said "Our resistance and refusal to accept that position is totally misrepresented and unjustly characterised as claiming the veto and intransigence. We are asked to play a game, the rules of which are to be framed by the Congress with loaded dice. This we cannot accept."

I referred at the outset that Mr. Amery's speech of December 12 is self-contradictory in the main theme. This requires explanation. Mr. Amery says in one breath, "Once broken up into separate and independent entities, India would relapse, as it did in the decline of the Moghul Empire, into a welter of contending powers in which free institutions would inevitably be suppressed and in which no one element would have the resources with which

one side and Afghanistan Iran Iraq Arabia East Africa and South Africa on the other on matters of immigration, trade colonial expansion imperial policy etc., and the result will be a constant state of war with these countries

On the other hand if India is split up into Hindu and Muslim areas the chances of such conflicts with neighbouring countries will diminish and the aggressive and imperialist policy of Hindu India will receive a natural check in the existence of two sovereign Muslim States on either side of Hindu India. These Muslim States will be a guarantee for the safety of the Muslim countries of the Middle East and Dutch East Indies as well as Indo China against encroachments from Hindu India

The British Government should visualise clearly the future. A weak and insignificant country to day with the germs of potential growth may prove in future the terror of other countries. Germany and Italy in the early part of the 18th century and prior to it were mere geographical expressions in Europe and did not count much in history but a century of political consciousness has turned these countries into the most aggressive States. The same will be true in case of India and China in future. These countries at present seem too big and cumbrous to be organised into efficient and

strong States, but the time will come when they will be able to pull their weight in world affairs and embark on a policy of colonial expansion and imperial aggression. It is in the interests of the British dominions in South Africa and Australia, which are yet sparsely populated, that India should not be entrusted to the care of a political organisation which may subsequently be carried away by a wave of intense nationalism and follow in the footsteps of the Dictatorial powers of to-day. The Muslim population is large enough to form independent sovereign States and these will counterbalance any dangers that may result from the transfer of supreme powers to Congress.

The problem of defence, so far as the present frontiers of India are concerned, will present far less difficulties than at present once India is divided on a communal basis. The Muslim State of Pakistan in the North-West will be strong enough to safeguard the western frontiers. The mere fact of the coming into existence of a Muslim State will revolutionise the mental outlook of Muslim tribesmen of the Frontier and they will be finally won over through economic concessions and an appeal to their religious sentiments. Their present opposition is mainly ascribable to their economic difficulties. They may be settled in selected areas or enlisted in the army.

trade alliances with Great Britain and will exchange its natural produce and raw materials for the textiles and machinery of the former. British capital will be attracted for investment in industrial and engineering projects in preference to capital from Hindu India. British experts, businessmen, engineers and technicians will be employed in preference to those from Hindu India.

There will undoubtedly be a spirit of healthy competition for progress between the Muslim States and Hindu India but this will not lead to a straining of political relations as for years to come their attention will be concentrated on the development of their respective resources and the construction of their internal social order.

In the alternative case in which the British Government decides to confer Dominion Status on India, even then British interests can better be served by a scheme of separation. It sounds odd that a bulky and cumbersome unit of 350 millions of people should rank as a member-State of the British Commonwealth of Nations along with small States like Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canada, Burma, Ceylon etc. The creation of two more Muslim member-States will reduce the predominance of India to a considerable extent and remove suspicions if any on that score on the part of smaller States. If it is really the aim of British

statesmen to have a commonwealth of nations, then it should be their earnest desire to see that no nation occupies a dominant position over the rest. India with its present size and population will be stronger than all the other member-States combined and will consequently in due course demand a voice in proportion to the numerical strength of its population. Hence the remedy lies in breaking up India into three or more units. This will lead to a greater sense of equality and a better chance of equal treatment among the member-States.

The problem of defence would continue to receive attention as at present, but it will not involve the new States of India into greater expenditure than what will be actually necessary in the interests of defence. Contributions will be invited to a Central Defence fund and these will be fixed on the basis of an agreed principle. Each State will have its own army and other defence services to maintain order and to defend frontiers, but apart from that every State could be held jointly responsible for the defence of the Commonwealth against dangers threatening it in any part of the world.

Thus the present situation has directly resulted from the ever increasing mistrust between Congress, League and Government. In the opinion of the Government, the political deadlock is due to the undue insistence on impracticable demands on behalf of the Congress and undue suspicion on behalf of the Muslims. In the words of Mr Amery the Congress wants all or nothing and demands not merely unqualified recognition of India's independence but also independence of India governed by Congress on Congress lines." To accept that position or even to move towards it would according to the Secretary of State, at once create infinite trouble in India and would "go far towards threatening all hopes of bringing about a self governing India united in some measure at any rate within herself."

The Congress on its side has set before itself the goal of Democracy Nationalism and Freedom for India as a united country and bitterly resents the British attitude in recognising the Muslim League as entitled to speak on behalf of the Muslim community. It considers itself the only political organisation which is entitled in view of its influence and power to frame a new constitution for India and does not recognise the right of the British Government the Indian States or the Muslim League to claim an equal consideration with it in its scheme of future India.

The Muslim League, on the other hand, insists on the principle of self-determination for predominantly Muslim areas, and holds both the Congress and the Government responsible for their conception of India as a homogeneous country entitled to democratic institutions which can only be applied with success in a coherent national state

No solution has so far been discovered to end the political deadlock. The British Government is prepared to confer on India Dominion Status of the Westminster variety. The Congress demands in theory nothing less than complete independence and a strong Central Government with the supreme executive power concentrated in its hands. The League stands for at least two sovereign Muslim States in the north-west and north-east, and seeks the final and permanent solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem in a close alliance of the new national states to be thus created on the principle of self-determination.



through a clever manuevring of words that Congress is not in a position to help in the war effort and that its present policy of non-co-operation is not due to any intransigent attitude on its part. This argument is really meant as a reply to those who have often said that this is not an imperialistic war that India should come to the rescue of countries which have been victims of aggression that it should not insist on any conditions as preliminary to help and should not take advantage of the present difficulties of British Empire

If Congress had been as magnanimous as Mr Rajagopalachariar supposes it to be and had been willing to postpone its quarrel with Great Britain till after the war the political deadlock would have been easily solved and a temporary basis for the settlement of Congress League differences would have been discovered. The Muslim League is prepared to co operate within the present framework of the constitution and to postpone the issue of Pakistan till after the termination of the war. It does not insist on any concessions as price for its help which may weaken the position of the Government or the Congress. It only demands a due share of power at the centre to intensify the war effort of the Muslim community as a co sharer in the future of India. It is unfortunately the Congress which has so far refused to come to a reasonable compromise. The Congress attitude has all along been one

of "all or nothing" It wants complete independence immediately and full transfer of power to Indian hands without defining how this power will be shared by it with the Muslim League which is the next biggest political organisation in the country.

The British Government is faced with a situation which admits of no easy solution. If it effects a compromise with the Congress, the League will naturally turn antagonistic, and the situation will further deteriorate in so far as the war effort of the Muslim community is concerned. With the Muslim League driven into active opposition, the British Government, besides losing the sympathies of 100 million Muslims in India and the effective help of the recruitment areas in Muslim Provinces, will incur risks of unpopularity in Muslim countries at a time when their moral and material help is indispensable. On the other hand, if the British Government comes to terms with the Muslim League and gives it an effective representation at the Centre, the Congress might start civil disobedience.

As a potential power for the intensification of war effort the Congress cannot compare with the Muslim League. It may succeed in raising war loans, financing schemes of industrialisation or mobilising volunteers for local defence, but it will not be able to raise powerful armies ready to defend India's cause.

various communities in regard to the present war. The Muslim League stands for an all out war effort. It is alive to the dangers threatening Muslim countries. If British armies are withdrawn from North Africa or the Middle East, these countries will be overwhelmed by Italy and Germany and colonised with the surplus population of the conquering nations. The Musalmans do not like to see the Muslim countries of Java Sumatra and the islands of the Dutch East Indies fall into Japanese hands. Holland in view of her limited population could not use the uninhabited islands of her Empire as colonies but it is almost certain that Japan will establish settlements in Borneo Sumatra and Malay peninsula if these are conquered by her. Thus an Axis victory will lead to the gradual extinction of Muslim population in North Africa the Middle East and the Dutch East Indies which can accommodate millions of Germans Italians and Japanese. The British Empire presents no such dangers. At the worst it will continue to exploit the economic resources of the countries under it but it will not use them as homelands for the British people who already possess immense colonies in Canada South Africa, Australia and New Zealand.

By winning over the Muslim League to its side the British Government will stimulate war efforts in directions hitherto unknown

The attitude of the League will have direct repercussions in Muslim countries beyond India. Sixty millions of Muslims in China and another 60 millions in the Dutch East Indies will be heartened by the news that the Indian Muslims have thrown their full weight on the side of the Allies. The Muslim leaders in the three countries will work in close collaboration and bring to bear on the side of the Allies, the resources of a combined population of 220 millions of people. The League attitude will again have a tremendous effect on the chain of the Muslim countries west of the Indus, extending right up to the Atlantic Ocean. Afghanistan and Turkey in particular, which are still pursuing a policy of neutrality, will gain additional strength in resisting pressure from Axis powers. The Arabs, Turks, Iranians, Afghans—all will become virtual allies in this war. Muslim goodwill missions will tour all over the Muslim World and the Allies' cause will receive immense support.

Let Great Britain choose a path which is the best in the furtherance of her war effort. The Indian Muslims hold the key to any future solution. Ignored, they will be the storm-centre of the British Empire, but conciliated, they will be the most earnest supporters of the common cause for which the United Nations are fighting.

peaceful negotiations with the Congress. The inconsistency in their attitude becomes evident, when they refuse to see the logic in the Muslim case, presented on similar lines. The League has repeatedly said that its goal is Pakistan and that there can be no compromise on this issue and that it is for the Congress to initiate the move for negotiations with Muslim League. On principle it is the party which has the power to deliver goods that should inspire the confidence and disarm the fears of the weaker party. If the Government can be blamed for not using its power and prestige in the right spirit and for blocking the way to a peaceful settlement by its insistence on the infallibility of its own position the Congress is equally to blame for its studied policy of indifference towards Muslims and its utter failure to win their confidence. If there is a quarrel between two brothers it is for the elder to win the good will of the younger if he is keen to seek the latter's co-operation in keeping his hold on the greater part of the ancestral property. But reverse is the case in India. The Hindus not only want to secure three fourths of India for themselves but intend to deprive the Muslims of the remaining one fourth which on no principle, moral or legal, they can claim their own.

The Congress presses for an immediate declaration of India's independence on the ground that it cannot trust the Government to



other countries of Asia. One of the main clauses of the Charter was that every nation whether big or small should be conceded the right to form its own Government. But when the Muslims interpret the Charter to mean that it concedes the hundred million Muslims of India the right to determine their own future in the Muslim predominant areas the Hindu press begins to show open hostility. The latter's resentment in reality was not due to the fact that the Charter made no mention of India, but to the hard reality that the Charter contained a clause which recognised the claim of every nation whether big or small to independent existence. The Congress in its usual adroit manner pretended that the Charter was silent on India but its real aim was to press Mr Churchill to declare in unambiguous terms that India as the home of a single nation would also come under the terms of this Charter.

Thus it will be evident from the instances given above that the Congress speaks with two voices and pursues a double policy in its dealings with the Government and the Muslim League. Those very principles and arguments which it insists on in presenting its case against the Government, become condemnable when Muslim League lays emphasis on them in presenting its case against the Congress. If the Congress is true to its professions it should discard the garb of hypocrisy.

## 2 CONGRESS WANTS SWARAJ

(Under Japanese Protection)

The Congress offered the threat of Civil Disobedience at the most psychological moment when the danger of Japanese invasion was imminent. So long as it was confident that the cause of Democracies will triumph ultimately and the victory of the Allies alone would guarantee India's independence, it kept on assuring the British Government of its policy of non-embarrassment in the present war. Just before the out-break of the war, Mr Gandhi in a statement to the press on August 29, '39, declared: "I cannot emphasise my belief more forcibly than by saying that I personally would not purchase my own country's freedom by violence, if such a thing were a possibility. My faith in the wise-saying that what is gained by the sword will also be lost by the sword is imperishable." Again in a subsequent article in the Harijan dated 30th Sept, '39, Mr. Gandhi expressed his hope that this war would end all wars and India would play an effective part in ensuring the desired end. His actual words may be quoted here; "Willy-nilly, this war is resolving itself into one between such democracy as the West has evolved and the totalitarianism as is typified in Herr Hitler. Unless the Allies suffer demoralisation, of which there



in not the slightest indication this war may be used to end all wars at any rate of the virulent type that we see today I have the hope that India distraught though it is with internal dissensions will play an effective part in ensuring the desired end and the spread of cleaner, democracy than hitherto

✓ The entry of Russia into the war in 1941 followed by that of U S A. early in 1942 strengthened the belief every where that the victory of the Allies is assured and the Congress on its part, too had no other alternative but to pursue its policy of non embarrassment. Mr Gandhi from time to time held the threat of Civil Disobedience but in reality he never intended them seriously and only directed his attention to consolidating the position of the Congress Under his influence the Congress started the Satyagraha movement with the avowed object of freedom of speech to oppose all wars but the real aim was to extort some political concessions to the exclusive advantage of Congress The League from the outset was alive to the danger that the British Government might yield to Congress threats and sacrifice Muslim interests Mr Gandhi like a shrewd politician played a double game He assured the British Government that though the Congress could not actively participate in the war effort on the principle of non violence yet he did not want to embarrass it for fear of

strengthening its enemies At his instance, some Congress leaders openly declared that they were opposed to all wars on principle and that even if Britain were to grant independence to India as a price for active participation in war, they would not avail of the opportunity It was commonly believed that Gandhi was a pacifist who would never advise to his country-men any step which might lead to violence or civil war In fact, his views were clearly marked in his confession that he had misinterpreted the Bombay resolution which in his opinion meant that "the Congress was to refuse participation in the present or all wars on the ground principally of non-violence"

To the Muslims Gandhi gave the assurance that Civil Disobedience would not be launched, as in the absence of Congress League settlement that would involve the country in civil war of which "he did not wish to be a living witness" He also believed that Hindu-Muslim settlement was essential to freedom and that without it independence could neither be achieved nor maintained It is relevant to quote here from some of his writings and statements

Writing in the Harijan of November, 5, '39 under the caption, 'the Congressmen, he says, "I make bold to suggest that the one way to disarm communal suspicion is not to offer civil disobedience in terms of Swaraj The position

that is about to face the country is that of the British Government in alliance with the so called minorities arrayed against the Congress single-handed Civil Disobedience against this combination is a contradiction in terms. Exactly the same position arose in 1942 and yet the Mahatma in clear breach of his own statement declared Civil Disobedience. He accused the League of depending upon British support but his own policy at present clearly indicates that he expects foreign aid, possibly, from Japan else how it is possible for the Congress single handed to carry on Civil Disobedience against the united strength of the Government, Muslims, Hindu Mahasabha and other parties.

Lest I should be accused of quoting from one solitary article of Mr Gandhi I reproduce from others which more or less express similar views. In an article under the caption 'Next Step' he writes 'Apart from the uncertainty of the observance of non violence in Congress ranks, is the tremendous fact that the Muslim League looks upon Congress as the enemy of Muslims. This makes it well nigh impossible for the Congress to organise non violent revolution through civil disobedience. It will certainly mean Hindu Muslim riots' (Harijan Nov 5 39)

In the Harijan of Nov 25 39, Mr Gandhi, while urging that all efforts be made to arrive at a communal settlement before direct

action is thought of, says, "I am painfully conscious of the fact that India is not yet ready for non-violent civil disobedience on a mass scale. If, therefore, I cannot persuade the Congress to await the time when non-violent action is possible, I have no desire to see a dog fight between the two communities. I know for certain that if I cannot discover a method of non-violent action or inaction to the satisfaction of the Congress and there is no communal settlement, nothing on earth can prevent an outbreak of violence resulting for the time being in anarchy and red ruin. I believe it is the duty of all communities and Englishmen to prevent such a catastrophe". Is not present the right moment when this appeal should be directed mainly to Mr Gandhi himself? In the absence of a communal settlement and in face of the threat of Japanese invasion, civil disobedience not only will lead to civil war but invite foreign interference and aggression

In another article in the Harijan under 'Baffling Situation', Mr. Gandhi says "I see no immediate prospect of Civil disobedience. There can be no civil disobedience for the sake of embarrassing the British Government. It will come when it becomes clearly inevitable. We must prove to our Muslim country-men and to the world that the Congress does not want independence at the sacrifice of a single legitimate interest be it Muslim or other. We may leave no stone unturned to carry the

that is about to face the country is that of the British Government in alliance with the so called minorities arrayed against the Congress single-handed Civil Disobedience against this combination is a contradiction in terms. Exactly the same position arose in 1942 and yet the Mahatma in clear breach of his own statement declared Civil Disobedience. He accused the League of depending upon British support but his own policy at present clearly indicates that he expects foreign aid, possibly from Japan else how it is possible for the Congress single handed to carry on Civil Disobedience against the united strength of the Government, Muslims, Hindu Mahasabha and other parties.

Lest I should be accused of quoting from one solitary article of Mr Gandhi I reproduce from others which more or less express similar views. In an article under the caption Next Step he writes "Apart from the uncertainty of the observance of non violence in Congress ranks is the tremendous fact that the Muslim League looks upon Congress as the enemy of Muslims. This makes it well nigh impossible for the Congress to organise non violent revolution through civil disobedience. It will certainly mean Hindu Muslim riots' (Harijan Nov 5 39)

In the Harijan of Nov 25 39, Mr Gandhi, while urging that all efforts be made to arrive at a communal settlement before direct

action is thought of, says, "I am painfully conscious of the fact that India is not yet ready for non-violent civil disobedience on a mass scale. If, therefore, I cannot persuade the Congress to await the time when non-violent action is possible, I have no desire to see a dog fight between the two communities. I know for certain that if I cannot discover a method of non-violent action or inaction to the satisfaction of the Congress and there is no communal settlement, nothing on earth can prevent an outbreak of violence resulting for the time being in anarchy and red ruin. I believe it is the duty of all communities and Englishmen to prevent such a catastrophe". Is not present the right moment when this appeal should be directed mainly to Mr. Gandhi himself? In the absence of a communal settlement and in face of the threat of Japanese invasion, civil disobedience not only will lead to civil war but invite foreign interference and aggression.

In another article in 'the Harijan under Baffling Situation', Mr. Gandhi says "I see no immediate prospect of Civil disobedience. There can be no civil disobedience for the sake of embarrassing the British Government. It will come when it becomes clearly inevitable. We must prove to our Muslim country-men and to the world that the Congress does not want independence at the sacrifice of a single legitimate interest be it Muslim or other. We may leave no stone unturned to carry the

minorities with us Both of the conditions laid down in the statement have been violated The Congress neither carries the minorities with it today nor it can convince the world that civil disobedience is not meant to embarrass Great Britain If Mr Gandhi had been really sincere in his regard for Muslims he would have willingly accepted the advice of one of the foremost Congress leaders Mr Rajgopal chariar in regard to the communal problem In a statement issued on July 16 42 Rajaji said "I am convinced if the Congress accepted the principle of territorial self-determination that I have proposed in my A. I. C. C. resolution we can make Mr Jinnah and his League accept it and join the Congress in a united political front The Sage of Wardha however does not find justice in the cause of Pakistan and wants to be convinced if it is in the good of Muslims

On January 27 under the caption Unity or justice Mr Gandhi admits in unequivocal words that communal unity is the first essential to freedom He says My belief is unshaken that without communal unity Swaraj cannot be attained through non violence But unity cannot be achieved without justice between communities Muslim or any other friendship cannot be bought with bribery Bribery itself would mean cowardice and therefore violence But if I give more than his due to my brother I don't bribe him nor I do any injustice I can





represent all the political parties and had to reckon with much opposition before they were established firmly. Like the Congress they claimed to speak for the interests of their respective countries as a whole and not for the parties to which they belonged. There is a close similarity between the Congress and the Nazi organisations in many respects. Hitler commands the same respect and allegiance in Germany as Mr Gandhi in India. He is more than a hero a national saviour or even a God to the Germans. The same is the case with Mr Gandhi. He is both a spiritual and political leader of the Hindus and pretends to speak with divine authority. Nobody can dare to criticise him and yet remain a member of the Congress. A host of prominent Congress leaders had to leave the Congress as they had incurred the displeasure of the Mahatma. Mr Nariman, Dr Khare, Mr Subhas Chander Bose, Mr Roy and Mr Rajgopalachariar all at one time held positions of immense influence in the Congress but their difference of opinion with one man alone in the Congress (Mr Gandhi) led to their permanent expulsion from the Congress.

With Hitler the main argument to advance the interests of the German nation is violence, while Mr Gandhi depends on non violence for the same purpose. Undoubtedly Hitler does not want merely complete independence of Germany but a dominant position for her in the world. This however was not the aim of

the Nazis at the start of their political career. Germany in 1933 when the Nazis came into power simply wanted back all those territories, which had been separated from it after the last war. She was prepared to negotiate on this point with the other nations. But subsequently, on the realisation of these objects, the Nazis grew more ambitious and developed an aggressive form of nationalism which aims at the conquest of the whole world. The Congress in India is exactly following the Nazi line in pre-war Germany. It claims to speak for the interests of India as a whole, but in reality its sole object is to consolidate its own position with a view to dominate ultimately the whole of this vast sub-continent. Non-violence may be an article of faith with Mr. Gandhi, but with the average Hindu it is a measure of expediency. Even Mr. Gandhi admits that an armed revolution is not possible, so the only alternative is to adopt non-violence as a means of achieving independence.

We cannot be misled by Pandit Nehru that Indian (meaning, thereby Hindu) nationalism is that of a subject nation and cannot be compared with the aggressive nationalism in Germany, Italy or Japan. Originally, nationalism in every country seeks to sanctify its position by an appeal to reason and common sense of the world at large. The Italians when they were a subject people never dreamed that they would seek expansion at the cost of their neighbours.

most part of British rule and for the Congress party is composed of cent per cent Hindus with few exceptions and does not command the confidence of Muslims. Only a hypocrite can use such language as the Mahatma to put the Muslims off their track.

Continuing his argument, Mr. Gandhi says, "Consider for one moment what can happen if the English were to withdraw all of a sudden and there was no foreign usurper to rule. It may be said that the Punjabis, be they Muslims, Sikhs or others will overrun India. It is highly likely that the Gurkhas will throw in their lot with the Punjabis. Where will the Congressmen, composed chiefly of Hindus be? If they are fully non-violent, they will be left unmolested by the lawless Congressmen who want to divide power with the warriors but will refuse to let them exploit their unarmed countrymen. Thus if anybody has cause to keep the British rule for protection from the stronger element, it is Congressmen and those Hindus and others who are represented by the Congress. The question, therefore, resolves itself into not who is numerically superior but who is stronger? Surely there is only one answer. Those who raise the cry of 'minority in danger' have nothing to fear from the so-called majority which is merely a paper majority and which, in any event, is ineffective because it is weak in the military sense."

The above statement is again a clear example of hypocrisy in language. Does Mr. Gandhi

sincerely believe that the Hindu majority is a paper majority as compared with the Muslims and that if the British withdraw from India the country will be overrun by Punjabis and others from the North-West? If it is really in the interests of Hindu majority which, according to Mahatma is weak in the military sense, to keep the British rule for protection from the stronger element, why does he recommend the withdrawal of British from India in defiance of the best interests of his own community? Nobody can believe him that he wants the British to leave India in order to dispel the fear of Muslims that the weak majority has the backing of British bayonets to enable it to play at democracy. It is rather the growing conviction in his mind that the Muslims can be overawed into submission if once the British cease to interfere in the internal affairs of India that has moved Mr. Gandhi to write this article. He exposes his mind clearly when he writes in another article: "I admit there is unfortunately an unbridgeable gulf between the Congress and the Muslim League. Why do not British statesmen admit that it is after all a domestic quarrel? Let them withdraw from India and I promise that the Congress and the League and all other parties will find it to their interest to come together and advance a home-made solution for the government of India." What this home-made solution will be is explained by Mahatma Gandhi in these words: "It may be

munal majority at the centre and for this reason demands its previous consent before any constitution is devised for the whole of India

Let us here examine how these aims and ideals of the Congress and the Muslim League have come into conflict in actual practice. We start from the year 1916 when the Lucknow Pact was signed. It was then realised for the first time that no constitutional progress was possible unless the Hindu Muslim question was finally settled. As a first step in this direction the principle of communal representation was agreed upon.

The pact clearly defined future Hindu Muslim relations in three respects:—

1. In provinces such as Bengal and the Punjab where Muslims formed a majority of the population they were to receive slightly less than their proportion of population might justify while in provinces where Muslims were in a minority they were allowed a special weightage.

2. With regard to the Central Legislative Council the pact provided that one-third of the Indian elected members should be Muslims.

3. It was also agreed that no bill nor any clause thereof nor a resolution introduced by a non-official affecting one or other community shall be proceeded with if three fourths of the

members of that community in the particular Council, Imperial or Provincial, oppose the bill or any clause thereof in the resolution.

The value of this Pact was recognised in the reform Bill of 1917 which it hastened. The British Government recognised the force in the united demand of the Congress and the Muslim League and declared that responsible Government would be the goal of India with due protection for the rights of minorities. The first stage in new experiment began in provinces, where a dual form of Government known as dyarchy, was introduced. This was embodied in the Government of India Act of 1919. As political thought progressed in the country, the Government felt the need of conferring further reforms upon the people.

The Congress and League at first worked hand in hand demanding further concessions but when the British Government invited discussion on the subject, sharp differences arose between them. It was agreed by both the political parties of India that the future constitution of India should aim at all-India Federation, provincial autonomy and responsibility with safeguards, but the question of communal representation once again came to the forefront. The Muslim League pressed for increased representation in proportion to the population strength of Muslims in the

Punjab and Bengal and the continuance of weightage held by them in the majority provinces. The Congress refused to reopen this question until as last by mutual consent the matter was left to the arbitration of the British Government and was finally decided in the form of a communal Award.

The Muslims were promised under this Award one third of representation at the Centre and assured of a majority of voting strength in four provinces out of eleven. This settlement of the main question at issue between Congress and Muslim League was followed by a further measure of reforms as embodied in the Government of India Act of 1935.

The first part of the Act dealing with Provincial Autonomy came into force in 1937. As a result of this Congress Ministries were set up in 6 provinces while in two more the Congress formed coalition Ministries with other parties. The Muslim League as a body was entirely ignored by the Congress and only such Muslims were taken in Congress Cabinets as could sign the Congress creed and openly repudiate the Muslim League. In consequence of this, the Muslim League members in all the Congress provincial legislatures turned into Oppositions, while the relations between the Congress and League grew more and more

strained. It became abundantly evident to Muslims that the very purpose for which special representation had been provided for them under the Communal Award had been utterly defeated in the Congress Provinces where Muslim representatives returned on the Muslim League ticket were deprived of a share in political power.

Another point which intensified Muslim bitterness against the Congress was their growing discontent in Congress Provinces where their political rights were trampled upon and increasing discrimination was shown in their treatment. The open discouragement of Urdu and the propagation of Hindi language by the Congress, the enforcement of Wardha and Vidya Mandir Schemes in the teeth of Muslim opposition, the restrictions on Muslim religious practices and customs, the encouragement of music before mosques and prohibition of cow sacrifice, were some of the many grievances widely ventilated in the Muslim press.

In the meantime the Congress, after consolidating its position in eight out of eleven provinces, began to press for a responsible federal government at the Centre with the further claims that the States' representatives should be elected by the people on the basis of joint electorates. The Muslim League strongly opposed this and demanded that the inclusion of State representatives should not reduce



Lastly the Congress holds that the minority question is a British creation and will finally disappear as soon as Dominion Status is attained. It is for this reason that it has so far delayed the settlement of this question and reduced to discuss it with Mr Jinnah. The Muslim League on the other hand holds that the minority question is real and is based upon fundamental historical and political differences and that unless this question is settled amicably first, the Muslims will not be a party to any constitution that is devised without their consent.

It will appear that there is a wide divergence of opinion between the Congress and the Muslim League. The former demands full independence which in practice means Dominion Status or the rule of the majority under the protection of Great Britain and presses the Government for its immediate enforcement. The Muslim League on the other hand will accept no government at the centre till Muslim grievances in the provincial field and at the centre are satisfied. Mr Jinnah rightly summed up the Muslim view-point when he remarked "What Independence? and whose Independence?" The British Government has already defined its attitude in regard to its future policy. *Dominion Status* will be conferred after the termination of the war but in the meantime it wishes the Indian leaders to come to terms and settle their differences.

The Viceroy in his letter had made it clear that the Congress should discuss with the Muslim League about the Provincial field and the Centre. Mahatma Gandhi, Mr. Rajendra Prasad and Mr. Jinnah were invited to Delhi for this very purpose. But the Congress leaders refused to discuss the issues raised in the Viceroy's letter and preferred to press their demand for independence without the support of the Muslim League. As long as this attitude persists, there can be no real reconciliation.

The British Government will be betraying the interests of minorities if it yields to the Congress and accepts a constitution at its dictation.

If the Congress leaders had been sincere, they would have pacified the minorities and secured their confidence. They, however, deliberately avoid the discussion of the communal issue as it exposes their future intentions. Outwardly they proclaim loudly that they will accept nothing less than complete independence but inwardly they are prepared to accept Dominion Status provided it is enforced immediately. An immediate grant of Dominion Status, they think, will strengthen their position at the Centre and establish definitely the rule of majority. The question of minorities will lose all its force as the British Government, after it has parted with power will no longer feel interested in safeguarding

the interests of minorities who will thus be left to their fate and will yield to the superior power and organisation of the Congress.

If this is the Congress state of mind, the duty of a Muslim is clear. He should boldly assert and declare that he will not support the Congress demand for independence unless it defines clearly what are its real intentions, and how it will affect the minority problem.

